W. HEFFER & SONS

$20 00
DE

BC 6-21-06

BR 127 .I57 1928
International Missionary Council.
The Christian life and message in relation to non-Christian systems

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T4-ALE-233

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND MESSAGE IN RELATION TO NON-CHRISTIAN SYSTEMS OF THOUGHT AND LIFE

Reports of the Meeting of the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem, Easter 1928

*

VOLUME I The Christian Message in Relation to Non-Christian Systems of Thought and Life.

VOLUME II Religious Education.

VOLUME III The Relation between the Younger and Older Churches.

VOLUME IV The Christian Mission in the Light of Race Conflict.

VOLUME V The Christian Mission in Relation to Industrial Problems.

VOLUME VI The Christian Mission in Relation to Rural Problems.

VOLUME VII International Missionary Co-operation.

VOLUME VIII Addresses and Other Records.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND MESSAGE

IN RELATION TO

NON-CHRISTIAN SYSTEMS

Report of the
JERUSALEM MEETING
of the
INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL
March 24th.–April 8th., 1928

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
London, Melbourne, Cape Town,
Bombay, Shanghai

1928

First Published September 1928

PREFACE

THIS volume contains both the account of the discussion at the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council on the Christian Message and its relation to Non-Christian Systems of Thought and Life, and the material on which that discussion was based. Preliminary papers were written by men widely known for their scholarship and experience on the relation of Christianity to the several non-Christian religions and to the system of thought and life which has been designated secular civilization.

The spirit of the inquiry to which these writers addressed themselves may be discerned in two paragraphs of the statement prefaced to their papers :

> The mission of the Christian Church in the world stands or falls with the conviction that the revelation of God in Christ is something unique, possessing supreme value and providing a real and satisfying answer to the problem of the meaning and purpose of life and a complete response to the needs of men everywhere. The question of the message with which the Church has been entrusted, and of the contribution which it may bring to the lives of those who have not yet heard or heeded it, touches the heart of the missionary movement. To meet the perplexities on this subject which are found to-day both in Western Christendom and in the rising Churches abroad, especially among the younger generation, a fresh inquiry and statement regarding the distinctive character of the Christian message in relation to non-Christian systems is urgently needed.

To afford the help that is wanted, such an inquiry must not remain within the region of merely intellectual argument and definition. It must penetrate into the deeper regions of the things by which men live. 'The strength of Christianity,' it has been well said, 'consists in its being primarily not a view, but a life, a spiritual, religious life, requiring implying, definite doctrine concerning God and man, and their relations to each other, but never exhausted by these doctrines in their collectivity, inexhaustible though these in their turn are by their union with the life of the spirit, their origin and end.' It is in regard to the vital forces of religion that a clearer and deeper understanding is needed.

These papers have been revised by their authors in the light of the record of the Jerusalem discussions.

This volume contains also an account of the discussions both in the plenary sessions of the whole Council and in the different sectional groups which dealt with the special religions in their relation to Christianity. The general discussion by the Council, as a whole, of the preliminary papers and the central theme of the Message was followed by five sectional meetings dealing respectively with Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Mohammedanism and Secular Civilization, and the discussion in these meetings was very similar to the debate in the full Council meeting. It was intended that each of these sectional meetings should, if possible, arrive at findings to be submitted to the Committee on the Message. Only the sections on Buddhism and Mohammedanism resulted in such findings. Accordingly, in the chapter reporting these sectional meetings these findings are presented, and in the case of the other three sectional meetings a brief summary of the discussion is supplied.

Certain issues were shown by the discussions to be of such importance as to demand fuller treatment than they received in the preliminary papers. Additional

essays have been written on these subjects and are included in the present volume.

This volume contains, as indicated, the statement on which the Council after long discussion and much searching of heart united in its endeavour to express its conviction of the grounds of the world-wide Christian evangelistic movement, the motives which inspire it, the spirit in which it should be carried on and the end at which it should aim.

A word of appreciation must be added in recognition of the thought and work contributed by Dr Robert E. Speer to the editing of this volume.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

PRELIMINARY PAPERS PREPARED FOR THE COUNCIL

CHRISTIANITY AND HINDUISM.

Rev. NICOL MACNICOL, D.Litt.,
Missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland in Poona.

PAGE

The Hindu Situation—The Approach to Hinduism—What Hinduism Is : Ritual and caste, pantheistic Hinduism, *karma* and *maya*, victory over the world and victory over sin, three contrasting aspects, divine grace and the supply of moral energy, religion as the devout life—Conclusion—Supplementary Statement . . . 3

CHRISTIANITY AND CONFUCIANISM.

Rev. J. LEIGHTON STUART, D.D.,
President of Yenching University, Peking.

The Approach—The Man Confucius and His Age—The Effects of the Life and Teaching of Confucius on Chinese Character—Confucianism as a Religion—Ancestor Worship and Worship of Confucius—Confucianists' Difficulties in their Approach to Christianity—Points of Contact—The Heart of the Matter 53

RELIGIOUS VALUES IN CONFUCIANISM.

Rev. D. WILLARD LYON, D.D.,
Secretary in the Far East of the Foreign Committee of the National Councils of the Y.M.C.A.'s of the United States of America and Canada.

The Background : Meaning of the term 'Confucianism,' was Confucius interested in religion ? to what extent has Confucianism been regarded as a religion ?—Philosophical Assumptions underlying Confucianism—Some Basic Concepts in Confucianism—Ideas in Confucianism regarding Man's Social Responsibilities—Ideas of the Supreme Being found in Confucianism—Ancestor Worship—Confucianism and Christianity 83

CHRISTIANITY AND BUDDHISM.

Professor K. J. SAUNDERS, Litt.D.,
Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, and formerly Literature Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Burma.

PAGE

Diverse Views of Buddhism—The Quest of the Historic Sakyamuni—The Living Forces of Buddhism and Christianity: A document from Ceylon, the Buddhist outlook in China, the situation in Japan—Conclusion—Appendices: A Statement by H. Kaneko San, Japan; What I believe, by Ishizuka San, Japan; Modern Tendencies of Burmese Buddhism, by U Maung Kin, Burma 119

CHRISTIANITY AND NORTHERN BUDDHISM.

Professor A. K. REISCHAUER, D.D.,
Theological Department, Meiji Gakuin, Tokyo.

The Religion of Sakyamuni — Modifications in the Essentials of Sakyamuni's Teachings: The emergence of the God-idea, change in the ethical ideal, change in the estimate of human life—The Religion of Present-Day Buddhists: The masses, the recluse, the liberal Buddhist, the free-thinker—Conclusion 186

CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM.

The late Canon W. H. T. GAIRDNER,
Missionary of the C.M.S. in Cairo,
and Dr W. A. EDDY,
The American University, Cairo.

Values in Islam: Doctrine of God, veneration for Jesus, devotional life, personal attachment to Mohammed, Islamic fraternity, self-propagation, liberal tendencies, by-products of Islam—Values in Christianity: Enrichment of Islamic half-truths, the doctrine of the Trinity as experience, the incarnation and atonement in Christ, the character of Jesus, Christian prayer and mysticism, Christian brotherhood, chastity and family life, by-products of Christianity—Conclusion: The spirit of Jesus, a spiritual home for converts 235

SECULAR CIVILIZATION AND THE CHRISTIAN TASK.

Professor RUFUS M. JONES, LL.D., D.D.,
Haverford College, Pennsylvania.

The Church and the World—Historical Development of the Rift—The Emergence of Science as a Rival—Values of Life in Non-Christian Circles—The Synthesis of Truth that is Needed—Naturalism Inadequate—Other Secularizing Tendencies—Secularism Inadequate—The Call for Christian Leadership and Statesmanship—Mobilization of Spiritual Forces—The Need of a Convincing Laboratory Experiment—The Need of a Comprehensive Christian Message—Christ's Significance for our Day—The Need of a New Conception of the Church—The Need of a Fresh Vision of the Kingdom of God—Jerusalem, 1928 . 284

PART II

RECORDS OF DISCUSSIONS AT THE MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL AT JERUSALEM, 1928

ACCOUNT OF THE DISCUSSION IN THE PLENARY SESSIONS. ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D., LL.D., *Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.*

PAGE

Introduction—Recent Developments—The Need of a Clearer and More Comprehensive View—The Attitude toward the Values in Non-Christian Religions: In general, in relation to Confucianism, in relation to Hinduism, in relation to Animism, in relation to Islam—Syncretism—Woman and the Missionary Enterprise—Secularism and Christianity—Students and Christianity—Latin America and the Christian Message—Summary . 341

REPORTS OF SECTIONAL MEETINGS.

Hinduism—Confucianism—Buddhism—Islam—Secular Civilization 381

PART III

ADDITIONAL PAPERS PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE COUNCIL

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THE RELIGIOUS VALUES OF THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS? 417
ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D., LL.D.

THE EVANGELISTIC DUTY OF CHRISTIANITY 441
Rev. J. A. MACKAY, D.Litt., *South America.*

A STATEMENT OF THE CASE FOR EVANGELIZATION . . 459
THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER *Archbishop-Designate of York.*

PART IV

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE.

Go and Make Disciples of all Nations—Our Message—The Missionary Motive—The Spirit of our Endeavour—The Call to the World—Conclusion 479

INDEX 497

PART ONE

PRELIMINARY PAPERS

PUBLISHED IN PREPARATION FOR THE JERUSALEM MEETING

Except in the case of statements and recommendations adopted by formal vote, the International Missionary Council is not responsible for the opinions or statements expressed. The preliminary papers were distributed in advance of the Jerusalem Meeting to all the delegates for their information. None of these papers were formally presented to the Council and no action was taken by the International Missionary Council in reference to them.

PRELIMINARY PAPERS

CHRISTIANITY AND HINDUISM

THE REV. NICOL MACNICOL, D.LITT.

I. THE HINDU SITUATION

THE religious situation in India as affecting Hinduism in its relations with other religions, and more particularly in its relation with Christianity, is difficult at any time to estimate and to define. This is difficult at any time for the reason that Hinduism is itself—and has always been—so ill-defined, so amorphous. And this is particularly difficult at the present time because Hinduism appears, more than at any other time in its long history, to be undergoing a process of change and reconstruction which renders the whole religious system and organization more ambiguous than ever in its central principles and more uncertain than ever in its boundaries. Sir Alfred Lyall, in a well-known passage written nearly fifty years ago, compares Hinduism to 'a troubled sea, without shore or visible horizon, driven to and fro by the winds of boundless credulity and grotesque invention.' When he wrote that description Sir Alfred must have been thinking of Hinduism as he saw it, in the jungles of Bihar, represented by the rude village idol or by the wandering ashes-smeared ascetic. Of that type of Hinduism, a religion springing mainly from the fear of demons and of the evil eye and of the ghost that haunts the night-

shadows, little need be said. It was with reference to this body of superstitions within Hinduism and to the bondage that they lay upon the village people that an experienced and large-hearted Indian missionary declared at the World Missionary Conference of 1910 that the one thing to be said of them was that they must be broken. No one doubts that the religion of the Bantu or of the native of the Congo must go—and the sooner the better—and this is not less the case with the animistic worships that are to be found still alive and powerful in so many regions of India as well. But while they must be destroyed, the manner of their destruction should concern us deeply : we have to see that along with them is not destroyed the spirit of religion itself, nor yet the soul qualities and sentiments that may have somehow grown up intertwined with so much that seems unworthy and that nevertheless, because they express the Indian spirit, have much in them that is precious and beautiful. They belong to the Indian heritage, and it is our part to endeavour so to bring Christ to the Indian people—high or low, worshippers of dark powers or of the Spirit that pervades the universe—that He shall preserve and strengthen all that is noble and destroy only the unworthy and evil.

It is not, however, with Hinduism in that aspect of its wide comprehensiveness that I propose here to deal. The fact that the religion can harbour these cults within itself and that they can call themselves by its name has an importance of its own and is full of significance for our interpretation of the ultimate principles upon which the religion is based and of the value of the influence it exerts upon the lives of men. But the Hinduism that claims our main atten-

tion does not care to be associated with these somewhat disreputable dwellers within its borders. It is a religion that, because of its long recorded history, because of the profundity of the speculations of its ancient sages, and because of the power that these ideas still exercise over the lives of multitudes in this land, demands to be treated with complete respect and is not afraid at times to claim to be possessed of a higher truth than any of its rivals. This religion is to be seen in India to-day in the form at once of an elaborately organized system of ceremonial, a subtle and profound philosophy, and an incentive to devotion which is powerful to move the hearts of men. That is the religion that especially challenges our attention at the present time in India, and it is this Hinduism that we wish first to survey from without as she stands among her rivals proud, self-assertive, not any longer apologetic.[1]

The revival of Hinduism is indeed no new thing. When Dr J. N. Farquhar published his *Modern Religious Movements in India* the fact was obvious and its evidences are set forth at length by him in that volume. In his closing chapter he reviews the course of his narrative and considers 'the causes that have combined to create the movement.' He

[1] It is significant that even a journal of so high a tone as the *Indian Social Reformer*, while it is so largely in sympathy with Christian ideals, yet resents criticism by Christians of even the most objectionable aspects of Hinduism. When a Christian paper, the *Guardian*, referred to the injury done in South Africa by practices like hook-swinging to high claims made on behalf of Hindu 'culture,' the *Reformer* retorts (June 11, 1927): 'Is self-torture unknown to Christianity? . . . Perhaps there was more real Christianity in the world when men suffered self-torture than now when religion is reduced to comfortable dimensions. Does the *Guardian* know what the Hindu thinks of the exhibition of the crucified Christ in churches and pictures? . . .'

sees them to be many but he concludes that 'it is quite clear that Christianity has ruled the development throughout.' That was in 1915. In the years since then much has happened in India, as elsewhere, that has profoundly modified men's outlook. The reform movements within Hinduism have not ceased to exist, but they and the whole of the religion that includes them within itself have suffered a change which is unmistakable and significant. This change may, perhaps, best be indicated by saying that in the earlier period the life and movement within Hinduism—if he may be said to have been within Hinduism—can be taken as represented by Mr Justice Mahadeo Govind Ranade, the outstanding figure in social reform a generation ago, while to-day we should rather have to choose a President of the Maha Sabha, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya or Dr Moonje or Mr N. C. Kelkar. The former claimed to be true to the *Bhagavat Dharma*, a Hinduism purified and transformed that he laboured to create. To the latter the chief concern, we may say, is not the reformation of the religion, but its establishment in power and prestige. The Hindu Maha Sabha aims not at purging Hinduism of its grossness but at reinforcing its waning energies and equipping it to resist its rivals and establish its unquestioned supremacy in the land.

The effect is a profound alteration in the whole spirit of articulate and active Hinduism. Its first concern is no longer now to amend its ways, but to assert its claims. The aim of its organization is to encourage physical rather than moral strength. What is called *sangathan*, that is, the formation of a compact and disciplined organization with which to face its foes, is what chiefly occupies its energies.

The Moslem is the enemy and those Hindus who in the past have fallen away to that religion have to be reclaimed. This is a *shuddhi* or purifying movement, but one of a very different kind from that which in the earlier generation sought to cleanse the religion from its impurities. The Maha Sabha passes resolutions removing the ban of untouchability from the outcastes and opening the temple door to them. But the motive behind this generosity is, it is to be feared, less a sense of brotherhood than a fear lest otherwise many more of these outcastes will, as they have done in the past, abandon Hinduism for a religion which at least will not treat them with contempt. The power of Hinduism, its numbers, its prestige, its solidarity—these are the chief concerns, we may affirm, of the Maha Sabha, and in its concern for these things it is representative of the prevailing mood at the present time of Hinduism and of Hindus. That fact is, it seems to me, more than anything else the characteristic feature of the situation as between Hinduism and its rivals at the present time.

The result is the establishment, with all its desolating consequences, of the spirit of communalism in the land. What the causes are that have brought this about is not possible to consider. One alone may be mentioned which includes others within itself, Nationalism. This spirit, poisoned and inflamed by the passions that the war aroused, has in the case of multitudes in India chosen religion as the flag under which are marshalled especially the rival battalions of the Muslim and the Hindu population. The consequences from this are sufficiently indicated by a statement submitted by Dr S. K. Datta to the National Christian Council, in November 1926, to the effect that between August 1923 and July

1926, 74 communal riots took place resulting in the death of 258 persons and serious injuries to 2811 more. These conflicts still continue and are only restrained from still more tragic consequences by the military and police forces of the Government. Dr Datta is of opinion that the problem that these facts reveal is fundamentally an economic one, but however that may be, it cannot be questioned that religion has supplied the battle-cry in these conflicts and has fed the flame of pride and jealousy and hate which is now burning in so many bosoms. The change in the spirit of Hinduism that has accordingly come about in the last few years, a change from quiescence to aggression, from an attitude of apology to one of self-assertion, has had an unmistakable effect upon the whole missionary situation. In this attempt to estimate in a few sentences the religious attitude and outlook of the adherents of such a religion as Hinduism—so vast in the number of those over whom it rules, so varied in the character of its influence—it is impossible to avoid generalizations to which large exceptions must be made, but while this is so and must always be kept in mind, it can hardly be denied that this exacerbation of the spirit of Hinduism, this inflation of its pride, is a fact of crucial importance in our evaluation of the new influences that are abroad in India. The messengers of Christ have to take this into account.

This widespread pride in Hinduism and the adoption of the religion as the banner of a national movement almost inevitably result in a slowing down of the activities of reform within Hinduism itself, as well as in an increased suspicion of the missionary activities of Christianity and of Mohammedanism. The motive behind religious activity is not now—as it had been

in the case of the old reformers—to make the people better: it is to make the nation stronger. Even Babu Govinda Das, courageous as he shows himself in his *Hinduism* in his assaults upon 'false nationalism' and its vanity, and in his outspoken condemnation of evils, has as his aim the desire to 're-vitalize' his people, to strengthen the sense of national solidarity and national self-respect. Still to that end he desires 'to cleanse it of all the degenerate tissue and toxic stuff that has gathered therein.' Others would call in some doubtful allies to the aid of Hinduism. Ever since the days of Swami Vivekananda it has been felt by many Hindus that the traditional Hindu ideal of inaction must be abandoned if India is to advance and take her place among the nations. Krishnamurti, Mrs Besant's protégé, desires for his country a combination of her ancient 'spirituality' with a capacity for hustle and an appetite for worldly prosperity that he considers she must learn from America. Others go further still and are ready, like Dr Moonje, who followed Madan Mohan Malaviya in the presidentship of the Maha Sabha, to abandon the central Hindu principle of *ahimsa* and to strengthen the fibre of their race by eating meat. In all these cases it is not zeal for righteousness and reform but zeal for the greatness of the nation that animates the Hindu leader. 'The relaxation of orthodoxy and the tearing up of sentimentalism,' says Dr Moonje in an address to the Maha Sabha (*Indian Social Reformer*, April 23, 1927), 'are the two elixirs necessary for toning up Hindu muscles.' 'Toning up Hindu muscles' is a dominant aim of Hinduism at the present time and the effect is seen in the reception that the Christian message meets with throughout the country. The

change in outlook and attitude which has been indicated may be summed up in a statement by an acute and impartial observer, the *Indian Social Reformer* (April 23, 1927). We may take the comment as being from the pen of the editor of the *Reformer*, one of the ablest and most open-minded journalists in India: 'The proselytizing activities of Christian missions in India,' he writes, 'led Hindu leaders of the last century to exert themselves to bring about religious and social reforms in their community. They were successful in stemming by this means the tide of conversion from the higher Hindu castes. The Christian missions then began to concentrate on the conversion of the depressed classes, and some educated Hindus were not only content that this should be done but even said that the only hope of these classes was to be converted to Christianity. This apathetic attitude on the part of educated Hindus no longer exists. Still, the movement for the elevation of the untouchables would not have gained the strength which it has but for the attempt to leave them out of the Hindu fold for electoral purposes. The humanitarian side of the movement has been greatly reinforced by the political aspect. Mahatma Gandhi's propaganda gave a great stimulus to it and now the Hindu Maha Sabha has taken it and other social reforms under its wing. Hindu orthodoxy which turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of social reforms is being brought round to a recognition of the importance of social reform as the only means of maintaining itself intact and, though immediate results are hardly to be expected, there can be no doubt that the change of mentality will eventually lead to a change of social customs.' This 'change of mentality' is the most salient

fact in the Hindu situation in recent years. It must be reckoned with.

II. THE APPROACH TO HINDUISM

In what has been said we have been surveying the Hinduism of to-day from the outside. Apart altogether from its teaching and the inward springs of its life, its followers have come, largely through the circumstances of the time, to adopt a certain bearing and attitude which it is important that we should recognize and take account of. Still viewing the religion in its more external aspects we may now consider how it should be approached by those who bring to its adherents another message such as we bring. We have dealt with an outer protective skin or husk of Hinduism that has been developed by the circumstances of the present time, but there are other secondary products of the religion in regard to which we must form a judgment and to which we must define our relation. Thus apart from the kernel of the faith there is, as we are aware, a Hindu culture or civilization which is the product of the Indian environment and the Indian personality and at the same time, of course, in large measure of Hindu religion. While taking our way into the fastnesses of the Hindu soul and endeavouring to define our relation to its ideas and aspirations, we must consider how we should adjust ourselves to this more secular product.

What do we mean by Hindu culture or civilization ? Bertrand Russell discusses in his *Problem of China* what the distinctive merit of Chinese civilization is and concludes that it is what he calls ' a just

conception of the ends of life.' From this comes, he tells us, 'an attitude of tolerance and friendliness, showing courtesy and expecting it in return.' It brings with it a love of peace and freedom from self-assertion. In this description of the Chinese outlook upon life we find much that applies equally to India. Mr Russell speaks elsewhere of China's 'large tolerance and contemplative peace of mind.' These are qualities that one can associate also with some outstanding and typical Hindus of the past, who may be taken as embodying the Hindu culture at its highest. They are seen especially, of course, in the Buddha, the fine flower of ancient Indian culture, at once its creation and its creator. But lesser men possess in their measure the same quality of nature; it breathes in the musings of unnamed Upanishad sages; in later times Tukaram, the Marathi poet-saint, exhibits its charm alike in his life and in his songs; and in our own day no one has embodied more worthily these Hindu characteristics than Mahadeo Govind Ranade and M. K. Gandhi. We may select the word *ahimsa*, or 'non-killing,' a word that in its narrower interpretation represents an important rule of Hindu conduct, and, interpreting it in a wider sense as teaching an attitude of reverence and gentleness towards all living things, we may accept it as suggesting the characteristic tone, the prevailing *ethos* of the Hindu culture.

When we pass to consider the ideas within Hinduism that have produced this temper of mind we shall see, perhaps, in what respects it is defective and why. For the present what we have to consider is what the attitude of the Christian missionary should be to qualities in the Hindu so attractive and so precious. In regard to China, Bertrand Russell's fear is that the

invasion of the East by the aggressive civilizations of the West will have the effect of destroying the old indigenous culture and the dignity and humanity that it has produced. He would probably say the same of India. His fear is that these lands may be compelled in self-defence to adopt, as Japan has adopted, the western ways of aggression and militarism.

Such criticisms as these give us warning of a danger against which, in our approach to Hinduism with our message, we must be on our guard. Bertrand Russell brings what we are confident is an unjust charge against American missionaries in China. 'They remain always missionaries,' he says, 'not of Christianity, though they often think that is what they are preaching, but of Americanism.' Similarly we have the *Indian Social Reformer* (June 18, 1927) accusing missionaries of bringing to the Hindu 'freedom to eat beef and drink beer' as though that were our evangel. We need to see to it that there is no shadow of a justification for these slanders, that we make it plain that the Christ whom we preach does not destroy any gracious and beautiful trait in the character of the Hindu, nor deprive him of anything of which he is justly proud in his cultural inheritance. He came not to destroy but to fulfil. It is our part to preach, not 'Christian civilization' —some European or American importation—but Christ Jesus, Son of Man and Son of God. He, coming into the Hindu *milieu*, crossing the threshold of the Hindu soul, will make what He finds there that is fair more fair, taking away only what is unworthy. He will not quench the smoking flax.

It may be that some Indians may themselves wish to get from us the secret of worldly success that they

think western nations can teach India. Thus a distinguished member of the Swarajist political party informed a Christian conference at Benares recently that it was Christianity in the sense of 'European culture' that India wanted and that the Christianity of Christ as found in the Gospels had not had much influence in the land. He defined European culture as 'a mixture of a spirit of dominance and race-superiority with the Christian spirit of justice and service.' But whatever India may ask for from us, this is not what we are called to convey to her. We are not ambassadors of empire, nor of anything else save only of Christ and Him crucified. Too often we have given the impression that our message was less wholly spiritual than that implies. 'One can never rid one's self of the feeling,' writes Bertrand Russell,[1] 'that the education controlled by white men is not wholly disinterested.' This is, no doubt, the cause for some extreme utterances and attitudes that one is aware of at the present time. I have heard an earnest and sincere Indian Christian worker tell how a missionary lady doctor won by her skill and her devotion the gratitude and affection of a patient whose life she had been a means of saving, but how when she proceeded to take advantage of the opportunity to preach Christ, all the effect was dispelled because she no longer seemed to be disinterested and to be helping the patient for love's sake only. The feeling that we must be careful to do no despite to the personality of those to whom we preach Christ, that we must take no advantage of them in any fashion, that we must cast away the weight of our prestige and authority has been, I suppose, one cause of the establishment of Inter-

[1] *Problem of China*, p. 222.

The King's Library

national Fellowships in recent years in India. The International Fellowship, in the words of Professor P. A. Wadia, the Parsee president of one of its branches, 'stands for the principle of the value of human personality and asks us to bear ourselves towards one another as God bears Himself towards us.' Those of all religions who gather into these groups desire to see 'a revision of personal relationships' such that they can have fellowship in the deepest things, uniting together in common worship, even if that worship has often to be wholly silent.

We see here evidences of a fear—perhaps sometimes a morbid fear—lest our aggressiveness be all the time a cloak for egotism. There are those who call upon us to give up the securities of creed or ritual in an adventure in behalf of the spiritual values, 'the adventure of faith to which Nazareth calls us.' [1] Another symptom of this spirit which is influencing not a few in India is their unwillingness, while convinced of the supreme worth of Christ, to join the Christian Church and accept baptism. They say, as one such has said, 'For the present my obligation is only to Christ, . . . my presence in Hindu society is far more useful and effective than in the Christian society. . . . I believe that things are tending in such a way that the more dissociated from the Christian Church and Christianity Christ is, the greater will be His appeal to the Hindu mind and heart.' [2]

I have quoted these opinions as indicating a feeling and attitude that is to be found to-day in India among thoughtful non-Christians and also among not a few earnest Christians. It is a feeling and attitude that is the product of a deepened sense—a truly Christian

[1] Prof. P. A. Wadia.

[2] *Conference on Evangelism* : Benares, p. 27.

sense—of the reverence that is due to personality, the preciousness of spiritual fellowship, and the value of a conviction that is one's own. That this new alignment of ideas in reference to the missionary's task is not confined to those who face the Indian situation is evident from the following quotation from a sermon by Dean Inge on 'Will Asia become Christian?' which has been widely quoted in Indian papers. 'What we most need in all our missionary work,' says Dean Inge, 'is a few saints, a few men who are really living such a life as apostles of Christ ought to live, whose lives are a living testimony, not only that they believe what they teach, but that what they teach is the most holy and beautiful creed that could be believed and professed. That surely is the way in which from the very first our Lord both taught Himself and wished His religion to be propagated—by personal influence. . . . That is, I believe, the only way in which Christianity can really be transmitted, and, as I say, what we need above all is real saints who will go out full of love and sympathy, without any racial prejudices, who will try to study the lives and beliefs of the people to whom they go, seeing on the whole what is best in them and so try to bring them to the foot of the Cross.'

'And so try to bring them to the foot of the Cross' —that end and our utmost efforts towards that end cannot be omitted from any account of Christian duty, and once it is included all the toil and sacrifice of Christian missions is included also. Emphasis is rightly laid to-day upon the futility of an aggression which has egotism and not the love of Christ and of mankind in Christ at its centre. As we draw near to the souls of our brethren with our message we must

put off the shoes from our feet for the ground is holy. 'The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle towards all, a skilled teacher, a man who will not resent injuries.' [1] The approach to Hinduism and to those who follow the creed of Hinduism and are proud of its heritage must be made in such guise as that. 'He must be gentle in his admonitions to the opposition.' 'Every act or speech or attitude,' I have written elsewhere,[2] 'that outrages and insults the personality and that comes into conflict with the sense of personal honour and self-respect of this people, shuts the door of their ears against the Word that we preach. And every foreign messenger on the other hand, who is knitting the hearts of the people of this country to his own, breaking down barriers, sweetening relationships, is in the vanguard of the battle of humanity and of the Kingdom of God.'

III. WHAT HINDUISM IS

When we come now to look directly at Hinduism itself and ask what it is, some things that have already been said affect what we look for and what we see. We want to see it as embodied in living men and women, in their conduct and character, in their aspiration and attainment. The important thing to know is how the personalities of men and women are being moulded to-day by this ancient system, what are the springs in it, still flowing, of strength and comfort.

> What are the roots that clutch, what branches grow
> Out of the stony rubbish?

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 24 (partly Moffatt's translation).
[2] *International Review of Missions*, July 1925.

There must be much ' stony rubbish ' in any doctrine and ceremonial that has flowed onward across so vast a space of time. Its past has its effect in what it is to-day, but it is what it is to-day that concerns us—what it is in lives refreshed and strengthened, or chilled and petrified. What is its value ? we ask, and by the answer that that question receives, Hinduism, or any religion, stands or falls.

This desire to get away from mere antiquarianism in our estimate of Hinduism, to make the study of its ancient documents secondary to the study of what it is creating now in human life and experience, is one of the ' notes ' of missionary approach of the present time. Formerly the missionary was satisfied to look at consequences from the religion such as are written large across the land—in the oppression of the outcaste, in idolatry and superstition, in priestly arrogance and impure legend—and to say : That is Hinduism. We want now to pierce deeper, and it is because of this desire that Dr Stanley Jones has devised what we may call a Hindu inquiry-room where Hindu and Christian alike lay bare their hearts. The aim of his ' Round Table,' as he tells us, is ' to ask each man to tell what religion is meaning to him in experience.' Similarly Professor Radhakrishnan in his recently published Upton Lectures on *The Hindu View of Life* recognizes that this is the vital test of Hinduism as of every religion. He quotes the statement of Dean Inge that ' the centre of gravity in religion has shifted from authority to experience.' ' Every great religion,' he says again (p. 60), ' has cured its followers of the swell of passion, the thrust of desire, and the blindness of temper.' The ultimate aim of Hinduism, as Professor Radhakrishnan might express it, is to attain ' an intuition of

reality' (*Hindu View of Life*, p. 20), or it is as it was often described in a single word at Dr Stanley Jones's Round Table, 'realization.' That is the aim, but it appears by the honest witness of most of those who sat with Dr Jones that it is an aim rarely attained. If we find here a difference in respect of this 'intuition of reality,' this realization of an ultimate peace, between the experience of the Hindu and that of the Christian, it may be claimed that to some extent the difference is due to habit and training. 'You Christians,' Dr Jones quotes a Hindu as saying, 'have thought about these things so you can express yourselves with facility, but we have not thought about these things, so we speak with difficulty. It was a terrible thing to ask myself the question: What does religion mean to me in experience? For the first time I realized how serious it is.' 'You Christians have thought about these things . . . but we have not thought about these things'—perhaps that expresses a significant contrast between the two religions: the one always and essentially a way of life and health, a source of strength for every day, the other a system of ideas or of ceremonial performances and only secondarily a motive power within. It may be said that all that this implies is that the Christian has learned to look for help for living from his religion, while the Hindu has not been in the habit of looking for such a thing; but do not these facts suggest a deep divergence of aim? We dare to maintain that religion has little value for men save as it supplies this help and that therefore we should look constantly for much help from it. To do so is not, as some would suggest to-day, the consequence of 'a failure of nerve.' It is, on the contrary, of the essence of religion if, indeed, religion springs

from man's need of God. To compare, therefore, the value of Hinduism and of Christianity in this respect is to do no injustice to Hinduism. To teach Hindus, as Dr Stanley Jones is seeking to teach them, to think about these things is to do them a real service ; it is to ask them to discover for themselves the springs of life within their religion. It is to direct their attention to what should be its central significance.

Ritual and Caste

With such central things then we shall try to deal here—not with the things of the circumference—not, for example, with ceremonial and not with caste. The former, except in so far as it symbolizes an idea or gives expression to an emotion, has only a subsidiary value in religion. When we examine Hinduism as a body of ideas and Hinduism as devout emotion, we shall be dealing with those elements apart from which the ritual is lumber. Ritual has, of course, its place in Hinduism, as it has and should have in all departments of the life of embodied humanity, and we must recognize the need of it. A thoughtful Hindu, who had abandoned the ceremonialism of his fathers and adopted a purely rational doctrine that had no ritual expression, found, as he told a friend of the writer, that in the hour of bereavement the old funeral rites had a certain consolatory value and he felt the lack of them when that hour came to himself. There is a 'psychological' truth in this that should not be forgotten.

Of the caste system all that need be said is that modern vindications of it sound unreal and ineffective. It cannot be defended. This is true of Professor

Radhakrishnan's defence of the system (in his *Hindu View of Life*) as of every other attempt of the kind. The desire to find some vindication for it is due partly to the nationalist pride that is so prevalent to-day in India and so natural, and partly also to a recognition that industrial competition creates its own problems and that democratic ideals have been far from successful in so far as they have been realized in the West. It remains true, all the same, that the whole edifice of caste is unjust and cruel and must be demolished.

Pantheistic Hinduism

We must now, however, turn to a somewhat fuller consideration of the governing ideas within and behind this religion. It may appear that in doing so we are turning away from our purpose of concentrating upon the most vital elements in Hinduism. To show that this is not the case, but that, to a greater extent probably than in most religions, certain abstract ideas live and move in the lives of multitudes of ordinary Hindus, I quote the testimony of one who has written recently with knowledge and insight of the Bengali woman. 'In actual contact with the *pardanasin*,' Mrs Urquhart writes,[1] 'when conversation turns on religion, as it almost invariably does, it is not of these daily practices or of the periodic occurrence of feasts and fasts, visits of the guru or visits to the temple, bathings or pilgrimages that one hears most, not even of the Scriptures and their teaching; by some strange paradox and in direct contradiction, it would seem, to what one might expect from a religion so concrete in its expression, so rigidly conventional in its usages, thought

[1] *Women of Bengal*, by M. M. Urquhart, p. 121.

seems to circle continually, not around the visible and familiar objects and elements of worship, but around certain ever-present and all-controlling *ideas*.'

Let us begin then by considering the idea of pantheism and how far it is an ever-present and controlling influence in Hindu life. We have first to recognize frankly that the amount of 'pantheism' that Hinduism holds within its wide borders varies greatly in different tracts. Theistic influences have always been present and powerful throughout all the Hindu development, and they are present and powerful now. At the same time such is the power over the people of this land of certain deep-rooted and ancient religious instincts, that their theism even in its most fervent manifestations, is a theism that always looks beyond itself to an impersonal pantheism. This statement will be challenged, and it will be alleged—and with considerable truth—that 'Hindu pantheism does not exclude the belief in a personal God.'[1] At a time when all the stubborn knots of Hindu doctrine are being loosened, it is to be expected that Hindu pantheism will be represented as being simply a deeply realized belief in the divine immanence. It is well that this result should be achieved and I have no intention of entering into the controversies that surround Vedantic interpretations. What I desire to see as clearly as may be is the consequence in the Hindu conception of life and its meaning and value that seems to have followed from these pantheistic presuppositions.

To clear the path of approach it may be well to recognize that the foreigner may frequently misinterpret Hinduism, deducing certain conclusions from its theory which may appear logical, and yet

[1] *Indian Social Reformer*, June 25, 1927.

which the deeper logic of experience may have modified in actual Hindu belief and practice. This may be so, especially in regard to this pantheism that is so often taken for granted as a fundamental rock of offence in Hinduism. No one, I suppose, not even the author of *The Dynasts*, has ever lived the life indifferent to consequences, indifferent to good or ill, that seems to follow from a thoroughgoing pantheism and from a belief in the blind movements of the Immanent Will,

> An automatic sense,
> Unweeting why or whence.

In India there is a saying that is quite often heard on the lips even of plain people when they wish to put aside the pain of some untoward event or to justify a manifestly immoral way of living. They say, 'The doer and He who causes to do are one.' That seems the end of all responsibility and of all ethical values. The writer once had occasion to point out the moral perils that that attitude seemed to involve. An Indian friend, however, assured him—and his assurance must be taken as that of one who knew—that, as often used, the phrase means no more than what the Christian means when he resigns himself to suffering and says, 'God's will be done.' We may take it at least that an unmoral pantheism has never ruled the lives of the Indian people—unless, it may be, of a few philosophers—that there, as everywhere, conscience will keep breaking in, and that at the present time the moralization of pantheistic thinking is proceeding apace, especially among the thoughtful classes. Fortunately for the world, life continually modifies our theory, and, as there have been few in India who have lived a lawless life because

they were supposed to be the unconscious instruments of the sole-existent One or to have passed, while yet alive, beyond good and evil, so there have been few in the West whose Calvinism has raised them so high or cast them down so low as *Johannes Agricola in Meditation.* The theory of *advaita* may seem finally at strife with Christianity and, indeed, with the life of religion, and yet the living Hinduism of men and women who profess that doctrine may prove to be far less so in reality and may be steadily travelling towards agreement.

Karma and *Maya*

These facts have to be taken into full account in our estimate of the value of Hinduism to-day in the life and experience of men and women. It is being, as far as may be, infused with moral meaning and fashioned to a form more tractable to moral purpose. But with all these deductions it remains true that it is an imperfectly moralized doctrine. *Karma* is reinterpreted on every side at the present time as meaning no more than that whatsoever a man soweth that he shall also reap. The fatal conjunction with re-birth is passed by in silence. 'All's law yet all's God,' says Professor Radhakrishnan. '*Karma* is not a mechanical principle. . . . God is its supervisor' (p. 73). The philosophy of despair is not, therefore, the necessary outcome of the doctrine of *karma* (p. 77); but it certainly has been so for the most part in the past, and its consequences are written deep in Hindu character. One alleged consequence may be cited. A Hindu professor who is eager to awaken his students to independent thinking has told me that he often found it impossible to stir them

to any sense of the problem and the burden of the world's evil. He explained this as due to the fact that they had received in the *karma* doctrine a ready-made explanation of all such questions, making no further enquiry necessary. If this be a true explanation we can see how this—apart from whether it is true or not—cuts the nerve of intellectual ardour. It takes away intellectual zest, and similarly the belief that all is *maya*, and unreal, weakens the nerve of moral ardour. Life appears meaningless and vain. Its springs are poisoned.

It is not easy to see how these ideas can be so made over again as to change stagnancy to energy, despair to hope, and how they can yet remain in any true sense the ideas of Hinduism. The fault of Hinduism in this aspect of it is its moral impotence. The virtues of the Hindu—which are many and beautiful—are in spite of, not because of, these doctrines, which belong, one must say, to the essence of Hinduism. They load man with chains and leave him helpless of deliverance. Hinduism has its lessons to teach us that can be carried over into the Christian faith and can be linked with the tremendous moral energies that are stored there in the whole ethical tradition, culminating in the divine Fatherhood that is revealed in the life of Christ and the ethical passion that is revealed in the death of Christ. But they must be so carried over. Christianity has in it springs of moral energy that Hinduism plainly has not.

Victory over the World and Victory over Sin

We have to make clear to ourselves wherein this aspect of Hinduism has a true and precious lesson

for the world and wherein it—as it appears to the Christian—comes short. The victory it seeks is victory over the world—a very great thing; the victory Christ's message brings is victory over the evil that infects the world, a greater and more inclusive thing. The ancient Indian sage sought for the former—he sought to subdue the world and the world's entanglements; the Jewish saint sought for deliverance from the burden of sin. Perhaps at the very time when the one from among his sheepfolds was praying, 'Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me,' the other in his desert solitude was crying no less passionately into the darkness, 'From the unreal lead me to the real, from darkness lead me to the light, from death lead me to immortality.' The petition in each case issues from a sense, no less profound and real in the Aryan than in the Jew, of man's helplessness and desolation if he cannot obtain deliverance from the enslavement of life, and if, to that end, he cannot win the help of one whom we call God. The shapes of their thoughts, the fashions in which they frame to themselves the universe of their discourse, may differ; the thoughts themselves are alike in substance and fibre, and the aim and purpose of their aspirations do not differ. The root distinction between them is to be found in that which each holds to be the source of man's enslavement. The way in which the Semite looked at the world seems far removed from the way of the Indian *rishi*. Both indeed seek reality, believing that there they will find liberation from a bondage of which both are aware, but to the one the bond that binds, the poison that corrupts, is sin, a will hostile to God and goodness, while the other cuts the knot of his enslavement at a stroke by

denying that the world is real at all. It is a wrong vision, he says, not a rebellious will, that has led the soul astray. That is an old antithesis, and it is not necessary to discuss which of the two points of view pierces more deeply into the heart of things. Perhaps we confuse the issue when we set them in antagonism and suggest that the affirmation of each involves a denial of the other. What we have to consider here is not the seriousness of their divergence but the possibility of their reconciliation. Of the profound and tragic truth of the Jewish testimony to man's alienation in will from God and goodness, the whole history of the human race is a demonstration. We cannot explain away sin. But when Christ came and took over from the Jewish prophets the task of setting men free from this yoke, and when to achieve that end He gave Himself to the Cross, He was not only bringing to men a message of the Divine forgiveness that wins the will of man to God, but also a message of illumination for their souls that brings victory over a world of unreality and sets them free from its bondage. For Christ proclaimed not only the forgiveness of sins, but the Kingdom of God, a new and eternal order with God at its centre, which only a distorted vision fails to perceive as present with us even now.

There is a wide enough difference between Jesus' message, 'The Kingdom of God is at hand,' and the cryptic utterance of the Upanishad sage, 'Thou art that.' And yet if this saying can be understood, not as the formula of a monism within which a moral being cannot live and breathe, but as the affirmation of the ultimate identity of the transcendent, unconditioned Spirit of God and the immanent spirit that dwells within the universe of things and in the heart

of man, then a way to reconcile them may yet be found. Christianity can make no terms with a monistic pantheism; there must be room in its universe for the spirit of man to live and love, and there must therefore be 'otherness.' But if the central doctrine of Upanishad theology can be so understood as to be compatible with theistic worship and with the moral life, then we can welcome such an exegesis of the text. Professor Radhakrishnan explains the phrase as declaring the existence of 'one central reality, pervading and embracing all,' and he appeals for confirmation of its truth to 'religious mysticism and deep piety.' [1] If it be no more than that, then it may be possible to bring this ancient word of Vedic intuition into harmony with the revelation of Christ, and to hear the Upanishad sage saying, 'The Word was God,' and even reaching forward towards that which follows after, 'The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us.'

But there is, and must be recognized to be, a fundamental moral difference between oneness with the universe and oneness with the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. The difference may be illustrated by what a very thoughtful Hindu lady told the writer of her religious life and its cultivation. She spoke of the comfort that came to her spirit through the repetition over and over again of a *mantra* accompanied by regular and controlled breathing. The *mantra* was the Sanskrit sentence, '*Soham*,' 'I am that.' What she was attempting, it appears, was to attain a physical and mental accord with the All of things. This harmony brought calm and peace. Such calm is the ideal of attainment to the Hindu—the 'equability' that

[1] *The Philosophy of the Upanishad*, p. 46.

Mr Gandhi says [1] the *Gita* helps him to reach, what the poet-saint Tukaram calls

> A peace supremely still,
> Supremely fair.

That is, we may say, the Hindu ideal of the good life, and is closely akin to the ' harmonious living ' of the Stoics. Is it the highest attainment ? Is calm life's crown—*ἀταραξία*, victory over a discordant world ? Or is there a world that envelops that one, which no man can overcome save by the grace of a divine Helper ? The ' world ' that the Hindu overcomes is, surely, something less real, less ultimate than the ' world ' of St Paul and St John. In vulgar speech a Hindu sometimes speaks of his wife as his *samsara*, that is, the ' world ' that he has to overcome or abandon if he is to be free. It is the complex of human relationships, not yet distinguished as morally good or evil. In this usage the world is as yet very imperfectly ethicized. But in Christian thought and experience, the process has proceeded much further. Its ' world ' requires a temper of spirit far more deeply and passionately moved, if victory is to be attained. The discords to be overcome are discords within a moral universe and the harmony to be attained is harmony not merely with ' Nature ' but with a holy God. ' If these should hold their peace,' said Jesus as the children of Jerusalem cried ' Hosanna ' and the Cross loomed near, ' the stones would immediately cry out.' ' Does this strange sentence mean,' Dr Glover asks, ' that in God's world there must be some response to God's thoughts ? ' (*Saturday Papers*, p. 63.) And the deepest thought of God ever spoken to man is spoken

[1] *My Adventures with Truth*, by M. K. Gandhi.

by the Cross. So the harmony with the universe to which Christ calls us is a harmony with His Cross. This it is, beyond all else, that creates the faith that is the victory that overcometh the world.

Let us remind ourselves of what Jesus' way of victory is. The world we live in, He teaches us, is God's world: we are God's children and in our Father's House and through the life of obedience and affection that is its rule we obtain our freedom. Bondage comes from our rebellion; sin is the word of evil omen that gives us the key to our unhappiness and our defeat. In reconciliation with God, in acceptance, as penitent children, of His moral order as the order of our lives, His love as our law—in that is the way of our emancipation, of triumph over an enemy world. 'In His will is our peace.'

Not by an intellectual enlightenment, but by a moral change, a persuasion, a capture of the personality, is this victory achieved—not by saying '*Soham*' but by saying, 'I am crucified with Christ.' The one seeks the disappearance, the submergence of the self, the other its transformation, its capture for a new and willingly rendered obedience. What the Christian motive aims at—and achieves—is not merely what the Hindu saint describes as 'breaking the neck of self-will': it wins the heart of the personality by the power of a constraining affection. The way to *moksha*, to salvation, must be a way that leaves room always for moral relationships, for the intercourse of obedience and love. An ancient Buddhist speaks of the way of Nirvana as 'the road to freedom, road that never wearied man.' But surely this other is that road, and he who travels by it can run in the way of the divine commandment,

breathing the atmosphere of love and holiness, by which alone comes life eternal.

> Make me a captive, Lord,
> And then I shall be free:
> Force me to render up my sword,
> And I shall conqueror be.

Three Contrasting Aspects

The aim of our enquiry is to arrive at a deeper understanding of what are the essential values in Hinduism and in comparison and contrast with these to reach a new understanding of what the Christian faith offers to men. Perhaps in what we have said so far we have appeared to assume too much the attitude of the censor and the fault-finder in our survey of the Hindu system. Let us then review at this point the conclusions at which we have arrived in regard to the two religions and note as impartially as we may, the differences that we have remarked between them.

In the *first* place, it is obvious that there is a notable contrast between them in their view of the ultimate Being or entity in which the universe is summed up, and in its or His relation to human beings. The contrast is one between Brahman—a neuter word—and God, the Father. Of these two supreme interpretative conceptions we shall not say that, as they have been held by Hindus and by Christians through the ages, the one is true, the other false. If the one conveys a conception of a power immanent in all things and the other a conception of a power transcendent—then we must concede that each has truth. The Brahma doctrine has value in reminding us that God is one in whom

we and all things live, that nothing has any reality at all except in God. But we must affirm that, valuable as is the tremendous emphasis that the Brahma doctrine places upon 'the sole existing,' the other truth of the Divine transcendence is a truth governing man's moral and religious life even more vitally. True, Christianity is not Deism; it knows that in God we live and move and have our being. 'Apart from Me,' says the divine Voice, 'ye can do nothing.' That we should all know: the sages of Hinduism may remind us of it and deepen our knowledge. At the same time unless we can hold to a conviction of the divine transcendence the universe we live in is no moral universe. 'Without the acknowledgment of the ideal,' says Professor Pringle-Pattison, 'a doctrine of immanence must degenerate into an acceptance and justification of the actual, just as we find it.' That acceptance of the actual is the real spring of Hindu quietism and lethargy and it is to be cured, not by eating meat, but by a new understanding of the meaning of the world and a new realization of the character of God. He is the tremendous 'Other' of man, the Holy One, against Whom man has sinned and Whose forgiveness man needs and does not deserve. The ultimate truth is not, 'Thou art that.' 'God,' says Baron von Hügel, speaking from profound insight and experience, 'is emphatically *not* simply our highest selves, heaven for us will not be a simple adequation or a simple identification (even in *kind*, apart from all degree) of our nature with God's: religion is *not* a simple and full intercourse between equals.' 'Man is not God, but has God's ends to serve.' Christianity may well learn from Hinduism a new and richer realization of the divine immanence, but it is

primarily a worship of a transcendent God, of One to Whom Jesus Himself looked up, saying, 'I thank Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth.' It is a religion in which man's status is that of a sinner saved by grace.

The *second* difference that we have to note between the ideas of Hinduism and of Christianity is concerned with the view of *moksha* in the former and of salvation in the latter. The difference in this case is closely related with that which we have just considered, for the *moksha* of the Hindu is deliverance from the world's entanglement, the salvation of the Christian is victory over the world's evil. The former is attained by the opening of the man's own eyes to what Hinduism teaches to be the reality of things: the latter is attained by the divine intervention and the divine co-operation. 'By grace are ye saved,' the Christian teacher tells us; 'and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.' Mr MacTaggart defines religion as 'an emotion resting on a conviction of a harmony between ourselves and the universe at large.' Hinduism might agree in that definition: and Christianity also, but the harmony is attained in the former case with an ease that is possible because its conception of the universe is sub-moral, while to the latter the universe is a moral order against which man is in rebellion. The way of salvation is therefore a very different way for the Christian from that of the Hindu. Again—as in our former conclusion—the contrast is between an outlook very imperfectly moralized and one which—being the outlook, however imperfectly attained by the Christian, of Christ Jesus—is wholly compact of moral meaning. The process of moralization, I repeat, is proceeding within Hinduism. Men like

Professor Radhakrishnan are 'lighting a little candle in the darkness,' as he himself put it.[1] But the surest way 'to make the whole sky aflame' is to welcome the sun's rising.

A *third* difference in the consequences to character from the differing ideas upon which the two religions rest has already been noted but deserves to be emphasized. On the one hand there is no quality that the Hindu more desires than that of *æquanimitas* and none that from the days of Buddha has adorned him more graciously. The attainment of a controlled and equal mind, as not infrequently Hindu saints have attained it, is something to be coveted. But on the other hand there is no quality that Hindus to-day more desire at the same time than a reinforcement of their energies. They wish to recover energy and initiative and to cast off the burden of their lethargy. Dr Rabindranath Tagore describes the patient, unambitious mood of mind that he finds to be so prevalent in India as 'the Śudra habit' and declares that 'under its oppressive burden groans the Hindu bowed in subjection.' He traces the roots of this attitude of ignoble acceptance of things as they are to 'the shibboleth' of the *Gita*, 'Better to die in one's own *dharma*.'

Here again we have to recognize that this spirit is being transformed. No one desires that the Hindu should lose his admiration and his pursuit of a spirit equal and serene. The Christian, so ready to be moved to 'righteous indignation,' has, before he censures this Hindu calm as being due to moral indifference, to be sure that he himself is not yielding to a gust of selfish passion. But the serenity of a faith in a righteous God is something wholly different

[1] *Hindu View of Life*, p. 130.

from the serenity of a sluggish nature. At the same time who can say with confidence which is which? It is not, certainly, a sluggish nature that is the source of Mr Gandhi's *sambhava*. But is man's chief aim to be, as Mr Gandhi suggests, 'to make no distinction between insulting, insolent and corrupt officials, co-workers of yesterday raising meaningless opposition, and men who had always been good to you'?[1] Professor Radhakrishnan interprets this *sannyasi* spirit as that of one who 'dwells in love and walks in righteousness.'[2] These are evidences of the manner in which the wine of ethical earnestness is being poured into the old Hindu wine-skins. But we must still ask, Can the wine-skins hold it? Will the wine not flow through the rents and fissures and the vessel soon be empty as before? That love and self-sacrifice have always been richly present in the Hindu soul, no one can for a moment doubt. What we doubt is whether they have been supported and inspired by these foundation principles of Hindu belief—or whether they have too often been chilled by them and thwarted.

Divine Grace and the Supply of Moral Energy

Mr Gandhi, describing to Dr Stanley Jones his own journey towards God, summed up his outlook in the words, 'No miracles can be expected and it may take ages.' The Christian in travelling towards his goal must expect and look for miracles—the miracle of the divine grace and the divine sustainment. Is there not this difference at least between

[1] *My Experiments with Truth*, IV, V.
[2] *Hindu View of Life*, p. 91.

them, that the thought that is behind the one can hardly bring more than a Stoic endurance, and that only to a few strong natures, while the other can say, 'When I am weak, then am I strong'? In the darkest hour the Christian's light shines on. There must be in the faith in a divine Father a source alike of energy and equability that is inexhaustible. In this connexion it is relevant to consider a claim made in behalf of Hinduism, as over against Christianity, by Count Keyserling in his recently published *Travel Diary of a Philosopher*. He affirms, as a psychologist, that the Vedantic identification in nature of the individual soul with the Supreme Soul has the effect of making men what they see themselves to be. *Potest quia posse videtur*: he can because he thinks he can. Is not this the way to the attainment of supreme blessedness? '*An Absolute One and I that One*—surely we have here,' wrote William James twenty years ago,[1] 'a religion which, emotionally considered, has a high pragmatic value; it imparts a perfect sumptuosity of security.' But to talk of sin is to make men sinners. There is certainly substance in this claim, and it is true that to dwell constantly on man's sinfulness must have an unhealthy and depressing effect. But that is not the Christian message: it is a message of deliverance from sin by the divine grace. The assurance of the divine co-operation gives something wholly different from 'a sumptuosity of security': it gives ever-renewed energy and hope, and with them the power to become 'more than conquerors.' 'Psychology confirms the teaching of St. Paul,' says Canon Streeter:[2] 'leave behind the Law with its associations of failure and of fear, throw yourself

[1] *Pragmatism*, p. 153.

[2] *Reality*, p. 239.

on the power and the love of God as seen in Christ, and sin shall have no more dominion over you.'

'These free men,' says Professor Radhakrishnan, speaking of the *sannyasis* of Hinduism, 'are solitary souls who have not any personal attachments or private ambitions, but embody in their own spirit the freedom of the world.' The way to victory over the world and to that freedom which is entrance into the Kingdom of God is, for the Christian, faith in God and self-surrender. These are elements, too, in the Hindu path to release, but each element—God and faith and self-surrender—is a far more shadowy and abstract thing here than it is there; and they lead to a shadowy goal. God (Brahman) is a wraith, and faith is the opening of the eyes to the fact of the world's illusion, while self evaporates in mist and nothingness, constrained by no love, won by no ideal good. All these elements have to be enriched. Substance—a richer moral meaning—must be given to them, so that they may not only illuminate the mind, but lay hold upon the heart and will. It is the child heart, says Jesus, that sees and enters into the Kingdom—a heart unloosed from the world's entanglements and from the love of evil. Perhaps to the Hindu the practice of Yoga is thought of as a means to the obtaining of that childlike and disentangled heart, for it is believed to cleanse the distorting mirror of the mind and so to enable it to reflect truth. But, again, how far this is from the moral simplicity and truthfulness of the way of Christ. Thus throughout it is by the moralization of the Indian teaching, the loosening of its *karma* bonds, the bringing of it from the abstract heights down to the level of our human needs, and the bringing of God near to us as the One whom Jesus could

call Father—it is by these ways of reconciliation that the Vedantist and the Christian can meet and can one day, we trust, rejoice together in the experience of a world overcome. But if this is to be indeed achieved—if, to change the metaphor, the house of Hinduism is to be transformed into a habitation where the spirit of man can dwell in the faith of God, and in the service of man, then it must be built again upon a new foundation, namely, the foundation of Christ Jesus.

Religion as the Devout Life

Thus far we have considered Hinduism as a body of ideas. But it is not that alone. It is also a means to the devout life. It has not concerned itself only with the intellectual endeavour to explain the universe: it has also fed the emotions and sought to satisfy the heart. The quality of 'reality'[1] is expressed in Hinduism by many passionate expressions of devotion embodied in the songs of its poet-saints. Here are discovered to us as nowhere else the springs of desire and satisfaction that this religion affords to its adherents, and here it comes closer to Christianity than in any other aspect. It is because of this, no doubt, that Professor Radhakrishnan makes the claim that 'judged by the characteristic religious experience, St John and St Paul have not any material advantage over Plotinus and Śamkara.'[2] Mysticism is supposed to have the same value and the same content in every rapturous expression of its feeling. We must agree with this claim to this extent that mysticism as a technique, as method, as process, is much the same in all times and lands. But we

[1] Streeter, *Reality*, pp. 45 ff. [2] *Hindu View of Life*, p. 34.

cannot agree that the value of the experience is the same in all cases, for its value depends upon the moral quality of the object to which it is directed and of the effect that it produces in the worshipper's soul. We have to ask of Hindu devotion whence it comes and whither it is journeying, for these things determine the effect that it produces in the souls of men.

Of the intensity of its fervour there is no question. In all ages of the history of Hinduism the cry to the distant God to draw near and make Himself known has rung out from every region of the land. Such symbols as those of the dusty, wayworn traveller, the voyager across the dark sea of life, the blind man tapping along the road with his stick, the child that has lost his mother, the wild swan winging its way home across the hills and plains—these and a hundred other pictures, full of deep human feeling, testify in every language of India to the sense of man's homelessness and to the instinct that his home is God. The passion and the longing are deep and intense, but their depth and intensity constitute, if they are uncontrolled, a very serious moral danger. It is not necessary that I should elaborate this point or that I should illustrate it. The peril of an uncontrolled emotionalism is manifest in the history of Christianity; it is immensely more manifest in the history of Hinduism. This is so much the case that a learned student of Hinduism, to whom reference has already been made, Babu Govinda Das, apparently considers the results from *bhakti*, which is the name given in India to the endeavour to reach God by love and faith, to be inevitably disastrous. The body, he says, 'is suddenly deprived of its guiding star'; it 'wanders into the jungle of passions.' 'Headlong,

unguided *bhakti* makes for horrible degeneracy.'[1] But if it is not unguided, if it has a guiding star, if it possesses at its centre a personality as lofty, as fitted not only to constrain the heart but to convince and illuminate the reason, as is that of Jesus Christ, then there is no such danger. No one can be moved by too passionate a love for ideal beauty and ideal goodness, and these are the garments in which Jesus Christ seems to us Christians to be arrayed. 'Love, and do as you please,' the Christian Father said. It is a dangerous precept unless it be the case that love here means love set upon Christ. There is nothing in aim and attitude that is amiss with the *bhakti* aspect of Hindu religion; it is the expression in a race, deeply skilled in the heart and the heart's needs, of the universal longing, the quest of the *homo desideriorum*. All that it requires is to have its longings directed by and towards Christ Jesus, one who not only wins man's love but satisfies his deepest reason:

> Christ, the beginning, for the end is Christ.

He is the one who alone, when such passions are abroad, can 'ride in the whirlwind and command the storm' and who can bring the pilgrim of eternity into port to God.

Thus here, as in the case of the search for a way to victory over the world, it is the ethical power and enrichment that proceed from Christ which differentiate the Christian from the Hindu system. Every other difference is insignificant compared with this. If the Hindu system will open its gates to Him who is the truth, then release from bondage and the victory that India so long has sought can come to

[1] *Hinduism*, p. 171 f.

her, and God's reign will begin. If the Hindu heart likewise will open its gates to Him who is the way to the Father, then this age-long traveller will find his Inn, this lost child his Mother's breast. Christianity is the religion of Jesus. When He finds His way to the centre of any system, then that system becomes His. He is able to subdue it to Himself and to cast out the defilers of His temple. The religion of which He is the centre will be, not speculation or dream, but a truth to live by. The God to whom He leads those who trust Him will be a God whom the heart can love, to whom the will can give complete obedience, whom the reason and the conscience can recognize as the Source of knowledge of the truth. If Hinduism will let Christ enter within its ancient walls, then it will be found that He is no stranger, but one who has sojourned there before and who will find within it those who will recognize His Lordship and set Him upon its throne.

IV. CONCLUSION

Let us survey in conclusion the two aspects of Hinduism which we have described, two aspects wide apart in the view of the universe which they represent and in the psychological climate in which they live and move, and yet both claiming with a right that cannot be controverted the name of Hinduism. Other explanations of things and other attitudes to life, as well as those two, find room within this hospitable system, but these two are its chief tenants and possess the most authoritative title-deeds. To them, therefore, that is, to the *advaita* doctrine on the one hand and to the religion of *bhakti*

on the other, we shall confine our attention in our final estimate of the value of the religion.

In summing up the case for any religious system that has ruled men's lives so long and so powerfully as Hinduism, we may fittingly ask two questions—first, as to the truth, measured *in abstracto*, the intellectual validity of its teaching, and, second, as to its moral value, its power to draw men upwards towards God and good. These are questions that cannot be wholly separated from each other, but if we use them to guide us in our investigation then we can, I think, affirm that the Vedantic interpretation of Hinduism deserves more consideration if we view it in the former aspect, while the religion of *bhakti* has of the two the greater ethical effectiveness.

The Vedanta doctrine presents to us a world view which is serious and profound. It seeks with extraordinary intellectual courage an ultimate unity which shall include all that is. And some such unification is a necessity of our intellects : it gives the universe a character and makes it possible for us to come to terms with it. But the absolute unity of *advaita* (nonduality) leaves no room for the spirit of man to breathe. Its unity reveals itself as a unity of death, not life. Its ultimate end is emptied of all ethical significance. The character it produces is subnormal : it is ' out of the swing of the sea.' It is at best ' a fugitive and cloistered virtue.' Its fatal defect is that it does not make men—and that, we believe, is what is the world's and life's final aim.

There is nothing that so much occupies at the present time the thoughts of earnest lovers of the Indian people as the question of how they can recover self-respect, manliness, the heroic qualities of their

inheritance. As Dr Rabindranath Tagore describes it, they have to rid themselves of the *Śudra Dharma*; their personality has to recover energy and initiative. This the *advaita* doctrine will not achieve for them, for it gives a wholly secondary place to the moral life and its claims. For that reason Christianity can make no terms with such a solution of the problem of the universe. It achieves unity but it is a unity in which difference is lost. But differences have reality, and moral differences have an ultimate reality which cannot be ignored. We must have an interpretation of the universe which shall unify it, but its unity must be to the end that of a moral universe. For that reason we believe, with Baron von Hügel, that 'religion has no subtler and yet no deadlier enemy in the region of the mind than every and all Monism.' [1] 'Christ,' some one else has said,[2] 'has two great enemies, the God Priapus and the God Pan; and while you can finally vanquish the former you can never quite get rid of the latter.' Therefore there is no compromise possible between the message of Christ that we bring to India and the *advaita* system that is so powerful in its grasp of the Hindu soul.

The second type of Hinduism—that which is commonly described as *bhakti*—is a spring of immense emotional energy and as such possesses great potential moral and religious value. It can fill the sails of the spirit and carry it swiftly outward. But hesitation comes when we ask: Whither? Down to Gehenna or up to the Throne? The intellectual value of the *bhakti* religion is of the slightest and its ideals are

[1] Preface to second edition of his *Mystical Element of Religion.*

[2] *Letters of Principal James Denney to W. Robertson Nicoll,* p. 80.

not by any means always high. That I shall simply state and shall not attempt to prove. The facts seem scarcely controvertible.

The evidence at the same time of the religious stimulus that this type of Hinduism provides is ample. Educated men of the present generation, who are themselves agnostic, look back with regret to the loss from their lives of this element which in their childhood they saw to be, in the case of their parents, the source of a real religious experience. An Indian friend has told me how, when his life as a student in the West had dried up within him all the springs of religious emotion, as soon as he heard again, on his return to India, the devotional songs of the poet-saint Tukaram, the frozen fountains in him melted and there came to him once more a gush of the old ardour and ecstasy. An element so precious, so indispensable to a religion that is real, must be recovered for those who can no longer find it, as their fathers did, in Hindu *bhakti*. They can find this, we are confident, in Christ Jesus, and, so finding it, both mind and heart are alike satisfied.

Christ Jesus is both the power of God and the wisdom of God. The fervour of *bhakti* is kindled at the flame of His heart of love : He is the source for us of an undying fire of devotion. That we possess and we desire the world to possess in Christ incarnate, crucified. But He who is for us *bhakti* is for us at the same time *jñana*. Christ, the Eternal Word, furnishes us with the key to an interpretation of the universe which leaves room for man to live as a son of God, while God Himself abides, as He must be, if our reason is to be satisfied, He who filleth all in all.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

The writer of the paper on Hinduism was not himself a delegate to the Jerusalem meeting and so was not present to hear the views of the delegates in regard to the justice and adequacy of his presentation of the subject. A report of the discussion has, however, been supplied to him, and it seems right that some of the more important criticisms and suggestions then made should be dealt with by him in a brief supplementary statement. It is perhaps inevitable that in any attempt at an exposition of a subject so immense and so complex as Hinduism there should be important omissions, and that this is so here was evidently felt by several of the delegates. It is impossible in this brief note to do anything like justice to the aspects of Hinduism that have been passed by, but it is right that the defects pointed out should be recorded and that some consideration should be given to them.

I. In the first place, then, let me explain why I dealt mainly with certain governing ideas in Hinduism and deliberately passed by with little more than a mention the mass of popular beliefs and practices. What is the truest and most just method that one can adopt in describing a great religion such as Hinduism? If I were describing Christianity to the adherents of another religion, how could I best do so? Would it not be by telling them that it is a religion which rests upon a conviction that the ultimate reality is an infinitely loving and holy personality whom we can call Father, and who has been revealed to men supremely in the life and death

of Jesus Christ ? It would not convey a true account of Christianity if I gave prominence to the fact that some hold that this truth is committed to a holy society through whose priests alone and the ceremonial they administer its virtue is communicated, while others view the religion as a matter of individual commerce between the soul and God, austere, unmediated except through the message of a book whose authority again is variously estimated. Whatever difference there may be between Christians in doctrine, in ritual, in organization, still what makes them Christians is the faith in the character of God and His revelation of love that underlies all this discordance. So also with Hinduism. The varieties of aspect in the case of the Hindu 'Church' are immensely more diverse and more numerous than in the case of the Christian Church, but to be a Hindu is determined by one or other of two things, either membership of a social system, which fixes a man's caste and its duties, or the acceptance, however vaguely, of certain ideas which are, I believe, fundamental to the make up of the Hindu mind, or the Hindu *ethos*. I deliberately turned away from the former of these. I do not believe that it would be fair to say that the social system of Hinduism is Hinduism. It is largely its consequence and rests in large measure upon the ideas, which, I believe, more truly represent the religion. Whether the religion will be able to survive the break up of the social organization remains to be seen. But it appears to me that the task of Christianity as over against Hinduism is so to present the great truths of the faith, summed up and made living and constraining in Christ, that the basal ideas of Hinduism, which are wholly irreconcilable with them, shall be seen to be

false. The Christian social order is built up or rather grows up by an inevitable impulse of life from the root of the Christian conviction.

II. At the same time it is quite natural that it should be felt that aspects of Hinduism that are manifest on every side and that represent its most obvious need should have had more attention. These are referred to in the opening section on 'the Hindu situation,' and are put aside as of secondary consequence, compared with the ideas that form an invisible buttress supporting them. We must recognize, however, that these grosser aspects of the religion strengthen the appeal that the need of those who suffer under them makes to the Christian, and it is right that something should be said, however briefly and imperfectly, in regard to them.

(*a*) There is what we may call the Hinduism of the Indian peasant. This Hinduism may be said to be made up of traditional practices, social and religious, which he follows (just as in the case of so many of ourselves) because they have come to him from his ancestors; of superstitious fears, which are more intimately his own; and of hopes, longings, aspirations. The traditional practices bind him to caste rules; they make him observe rites such as those for the dead, at certain seasons, or worship the family deity at stated times. The fears for himself or for his children that beset him impel him to make vows or to call for help to heaven in his distress. The hopes and aspirations drive him out, perhaps, on pilgrimage or make him seek the guidance of a preceptor. These are only a few of the multitude of ways in which the life of the past, the life of each day as it dawns, and the life of the as yet undisclosed

future, drive or draw the common man to kneel or tremble or aspire. This is the religion of the common man to which, as one critic observed, my paper did not give enough attention. It is a religion as endless in its variety and complexity as are 'the windy ways of men.'

(*b*) But in addition there is what we may distinguish perhaps as the religion of the ordinary, educated man who is no philosophical thinker. Of him we may say that he may belong largely still, in spite of his education, to the class that practises the old social and religious customs. He may do so without any belief because his home conditions demand such conformity; or he may do so because he chooses—with something approximating to faith—to walk in the way of his fathers. Or again he may practise no religion, acknowledge no God, call himself an agnostic. In the case of all these kinds of people—as of the peasant and the illiterate as well—the real religion that they follow (as in the case of so many in every land, East and West) is most often secularism. As one of their own proverbs puts it, 'First the Stomach God (*Potoba*) and after him *Vithoba*.' But when death or calamity comes, then, it may be, there is a return to the old rituals and a resort to the old gods.

(*c*) There is another class (one among many) that may be mentioned as having a Hinduism of their own. One of the delegates mentioned 'the Hindu women whose hearts are still untainted by the growing secularism.' Among them, no doubt, a simple faith or a dread of the unknown that is not selfish but is concerned on account of others, still creates a spirit of devotion and of self-sacrifice that is beautiful and sincere. But of that I shall speak in connexion with

the gracious qualities that Hinduism has produced in so many of its children.

III. It was evidently felt by a number of delegates that my paper was defective in not recognizing the place in Hinduism of the home with the religious duties which centre in it. This is also suggested by the criticism that my account of Hinduism is lacking on the human side. This, I think, is a thoroughly justifiable criticism. Hinduism, like every living religion, is closely intertwined with the life, and the practices and duties, of every day. It is right that we should view it in relation to the virtues that we see exemplified in Hindu character and conduct and that are seen at their best in the Hindu home. The Hindu wife, *pativrati stri*, that is, the woman wholly devoted to her husband, embodies an ideal of self-sacrifice, patience and devotion that not India alone but all the world can reverence. Sita, among the semi-divine figures of mythology, Mirabai, the wife of a Rajput prince in a later age, Mrs Ramabai Ranade in our own day—each of them presents with extraordinary charm this ideal. The influence of this ideal has always given and gives still a wistful beauty to Hindu womanhood. One delegate challenged my right to speak of 'the moral impotence of Hinduism.' But I think I may claim to have guarded my statement. I say, 'The fault of Hinduism *in this aspect of it* is its moral impotence.' The doctrines of *karma* and *maya* (which constitute the aspect referred to) have, in the case of multitudes, I believe, multitudes even who could give little account of these doctrines, a subtle influence in weakening the fibre of moral energy. At the same time I have tried to emphasize the fact that, as I say, 'life con-

tinually modifies our theory.' Not only is this exemplified in the gracious qualities that, in spite of these hostile theories, blossom so often in the lives of Hindu men and women: it is to be seen similarly in Thomas Hardy, to whom I refer in my paper as one whose view of life is closely akin to that which *advaita* produces. In spite of his doctrine—indeed partly, perhaps, as a consequence of its very refusal to allow any place to pity or to hope—he himself, like so many within Hinduism from the days of Buddha, had a heart singularly full of pity and tenderness. Just because this doctrine is false and because the human heart has its roots still, however overlaid by error and untruth, in the Infinite Love, its inextinguishable faith blossoms and is fragrant in such lives as those of so many Hindu mothers and so many much-enduring Hindu wives. But these are 'flowers on furze': the prevailing tone of Hindu life, I think we may not unjustly maintain, is drab, dull, spiritless. It lacks ardour. Its chief virtue is submission.

I think there is a sense in which it is true, as was claimed in the discussion of this paper, 'that a passion for freedom is implied in the idea of *moksha*.' Sister Nivedita has said something to that effect, and the cries of the Buddhist 'Sisters' show it to be an ancient longing, and not all the determinism of the centuries since has quenched it. The wild, living heart of man prevails against many hostile forces, but the passion for freedom is a passion that Hinduism leaves, to the end, impotent of attainment. Mr M. G. Ranade, who was, of course, a theist and a Hindu heretic, was fond of quoting the words of an Upanishad—'If there were no spirit of joy in the Universe, who could live and breathe in this world of life?' Who can

maintain that there is any vital and vitalizing spirit of joy behind the veil of *maya* that enshrouds the Hindu universe ? Such a spirit of joy breaks forth at times uncontrollably and is represented by Krishna Muralidharda, the young man with his flute—but that is possible only because not even Pelion upon Ossa can wholly overwhelm the human heart.

IV. Finally, we need not, I think, stay to deal with questions of the continuity of Christianity with Hinduism and of Christianity's superiority. Whether there is a gulf between the messages of the religions or not is a matter largely to be determined by the experience of the Hindu who has come to Christ, and his experience depends, in large measure, on whether he is what William James calls a twice-born man or a once-born one. Pandita Ramabai was aware of the deep waters to be crossed and of her need to be carried over them by the divine power ; Narayan Vaman Tilak passed over, it may be, scarcely wetting his feet. But both would freely admit that the divine grace met them, and led or carried them across. And this, surely, is the key to the question of ' superiority.' The man of the West can never claim that he has climbed further to God than the man of the East. The truth is wholly otherwise. But God has come to meet him all the way, God and the grace of God are in Christ as nowhere else in the universe. That we affirm. That seems to be what an Indian delegate pointed out in the discussion. ' The least in the kingdom of heaven '—the poorest creatures among us Christians of the West, poor in our lack of insight into religious truth compared with many Hindus, and in our lack of the natural *pietas*, the spirit of submission and acceptance, that is so

often to be seen in them—'the least in the kingdom of heaven,' who has obtained a glimpse of God as He is seen in the face of Christ Jesus, is greater than any on whom that light has never shone. But it is a 'superiority' that can only humble him in the dust.

CHRISTIANITY AND CONFUCIANISM

THE REV. JOHN LEIGHTON STUART, D.D.

FOREWORD

THE following pages have been prepared during absence from China and in the midst of preoccupation with other duties which would have made impossible any special study of the subject. The writer is very much indebted to his friend of many years, Dr D. Willard Lyon, for the material found in the manuscript of his *Confucianism To-day* and for quotations patiently collected from a number of Chinese and Western sources, both of which have been freely drawn upon. Acknowledgment of such references in detail has purposely not been made in an effort to avoid diverting attention from the main current of thought. For the rest this paper is in the main a record of impressions slowly formed through association with Chinese friends, particularly those who have become Christians while retaining in their attitudes and character the beneficial effects of Confucian teaching. His own appreciation of this Way of Life has but strengthened the writer's consciousness of the universal reality of Religion and his confidence that Jesus Christ not only manifests this supremely but is becoming the surest, possibly the only, guaranty that the abiding values in other great religions will not hereafter perish from the earth. Mankind in many parts of the world appears to be dividing into those who worship the God revealed by Jesus and

those who deny or ignore His existence. Thus conceived each one of them has its useful contribution toward a better understanding of the Truth He made incarnate ; and the people it has hitherto guided and sustained need now more than ever before, because of new world-contacts, the inclusive outlook and vitalizing power that should be born of faith in Him.

J. L. S.

I. THE APPROACH

This paper was written in preparation for a world-wide conference on Christian missions to be held early in the second quarter of the twentieth century. It is therefore intensely practical in its content and purpose. It is concerned only with the reasons for or against the continuance of missionary efforts in China. These have now been in process for 120 years. Judged by conventional standards of tangible results, their effectiveness has been seriously questioned. Some of the assumptions which underlay the original urge to such efforts are now seen to be crude and obsolete. New and ever-improving methods of communication have enabled Chinese in large numbers to travel or study abroad and to read, even in the remotest villages of their own land, books and periodicals that convey knowledge on every subject felt to be of value. They are able, therefore, without assistance from others to appropriate from western experience or discovery whatever they desire, including the teachings of the Christian religion and their application to life. They are making trenchant criticisms of our civilization as they observe it, and they contrast its dominant features with

those of their own in comments that open even our eyes to the hitherto unrealized evils of the one and the perhaps still less clearly apprehended excellencies of the other. Not only so, but many of them attribute the futilities or false emphases of western culture in large measure to the influence of Christianity, and when these faults are explained as due to historical causes or to those inherent in human organization, they remain convinced that the religious beliefs which produced such effects or have at least failed to prevent them are undesirable for a people with such a tradition as theirs. Comparisons not unfavourable to Confucian China are by no means confined to its own keen-minded observers. Increasing knowledge of foreign lands and other liberalizing tendencies have persuaded some Christians in the West that it is only a bigoted impertinence that would force our faith upon a people with such a civilization as the Chinese possess. Especially have the effects on organized missionary activity of recent political and military disturbances in China led many supporters of ' foreign missions ' to doubt, if not to disapprove, any plea for their continued maintenance. Entirely apart from any enquiry as to the relative merits of the two systems, many Chinese qualified to judge are of the opinion that western Christianity is itself moribund, having been discredited by scientific progress in its own territory and having succumbed to the allurements of capitalistic support in a materialized society, but chiefly because the premises on which its validity and vitality depend are regarded as no longer tenable. Has, therefore, the Christian Church in the present age a message for a nation sustained through many centuries by Confucian culture and eager now, as well as competent, to reinforce that

culture with modern scientific achievement? And granted that there is a message, is there any longer for those of other nations the obligation, or even the opportunity, to maintain missionary activities on Chinese soil? The answer attempted in the following paragraphs to such questionings as these is not intended as a defence of the missionary enterprise in China either in its theory or in its actual working out. Still less do they contain an argument aimed at awakening or renewing in us of the West a sense of our duty, or establishing in the Chinese consciousness a sense of our right, to continue this enterprise. Nor does this paper undertake any comprehensive treatment of Confucianism in its historical or philosophical aspects. There is an ample and easily accessible literature on the subject. This is scarcely more than the personal convictions simply told of one who, as a missionary and the son of missionaries, has lived the larger part of his life among the Chinese people with an ever-deepening appreciation of the values in their ancient heritage and esteem for many individuals among them as well as for the nation itself, and who has by this process discovered such new beauty and fresh power in the religion of Jesus as for him would perhaps not have been otherwise possible. Such a transcript from life is of interest only as typical of a common experience shared by an increasing number of western and Chinese Christians. Confucianism thus regarded is a convenient term for that complex of moral and cultural forces which has made the Chinese what they are to-day. One can best understand it by attempting to abstract the distinctive qualities of Chinese life as it has actually been flowing on down to the present, its hopes and fears, its incentives to noble conduct and its inhibitions,

its ethical dynamic and its religious implications. So profoundly have the personality and teachings of Confucius permeated the life of the race that the history of China has been the continuous flowering out of the Confucian doctrine. Much that is peculiar to this civilization can become intelligible only by the study of the sage and his followers through successive periods of controversy and reform, revival and stagnation. In the light of this mellowed contribution to the thought and experience of humanity, elements that have been accepted as an integral part of the Christian faith slough off as accretions due to Greek philosophy or Roman law, to the accident of European happenings, or to the American instinct for visible achievement, whereas the abiding and universal elements in the religion of Jesus are given fresh meaning and value. In attempting humbly to share the Christian Gospel with a people among whom the Confucian ideals have ripened, we of the West may expect that this effort will accentuate our own sense of its surpassing significance while enabling us to discard irrelevancies or rectify inconsistencies that obscure it for them as they will for future generations in the West. In short, the determination to mediate the Gospel of Christ to the people of China ought to result not in destroying for them but in fulfilling the noblest aspirations of Confucian teaching and in supplementing these with its own unique and essential features, while bringing to ourselves the corrective influences it can exert upon the defects of our civilization and a broader, better-balanced understanding of our own religious faith.

II. THE MAN CONFUCIUS AND HIS AGE

Confucius lived in a period of political disintegration and intellectual uncertainty. It was natural that with his training for government service he was primarily concerned with social and political reform. He travelled patiently from one to another of the independent states into which the even then ancient attempt at unifying China under the Chôu Dynasty had dissolved, hoping to find a prince who would listen to his counsels and allow him to apply his theories. When sixty-eight years old he ceased these efforts and devoted the rest of his life to his growing school of devoted disciples and to literary activity as the twofold vehicle for perpetuating the task to which he had dedicated his life. In an age of moral decadence and economic distress, of civil strife and social maladjustments, he searched the recorded experience of the race for any knowledge that would point the way toward regaining the happier conditions when kings ruled with justice and mercy and an obedient people lived in contented comfort, when government officers were faithful in their duties, and the laws were observed by citizens educated to understand reciprocal obligations, when fathers were fatherly and sons were filial, and all men tried to live in harmony with one another and with Heaven's Will. But this ideal society could come again into being only where correct principles were understood. There must be intellectual certainty in order that there may be morality and harmonious living; hence the supreme importance of learning for the leaders. Self-discipline through study produces character and this fits each one for

his function in the family, society or the State. Virtue in the rulers awakens like conduct in their subjects. Out of long experience the family had become the social unit and the pattern for the successive enlargements of corporate existence into district, province and kingdom. Despite the breakdown of paternal feudalism in his own age, Confucius believed that society thus organized under moralized leadership and with mutual relationships properly maintained by all would bring about the sorely needed reforms. To the advocacy of such principles in the hope of social and political reformation he gave himself with a singleness of aim, a consistency of teaching and of practice, a thoroughness of historical scholarship, a clarity of insight, a steadfast hopefulness in spite of apparent failure and a richly human warmth of feeling which won the admiring affection of a constantly increasing band of contemporary followers, transmitted by them to successive generations for nearly 2500 years. This attachment to his person lingers on. Not only has he been continuously the model for imitation to all educated Chinese, but even now their modern scholars, who have become dissatisfied with much in his system of social ethics, seldom lose the glad sense of allegiance to the man. This magnetic influence of a single personality through so long a period in the history of so vast a population is an arresting phenomenon. It is not only a tribute to the character of Confucius. It is also the glory of the Chinese nation that with the sureness of instinct they have unswervingly reverenced as the greatest of their race a man whose one outstanding characteristic was his passion for righteousness. The one most conspicuous among his living disciples in his efforts to

revive Confucianism as the State religion speaks of him thus: 'Confucius was a great philosopher, a great statesman, a great educator, and a great musician; but above all he was the founder of a great religion.' Whether one agrees or not with these assertions, the impression formed by contact with Chinese literature and life is irresistibly that his supremacy has been chiefly due to their recognition of his moral earnestness and its evidential value in his own example. The extravagantly phrased and conventionalized ascriptions, celebrating his virtue as equal to that of Heaven and Earth, which adorn a thousand temples in his honour over all the land, are proof of this and of the further significant fact that through him, as the highest and best of men whom they have known, they have persistently sought the reality that lies at the heart of the universe.

As a philosopher Confucius was a pragmatist. The burden upon his soul because of current disorders forced him to think primarily of practical aids to rectifying conduct. For this reason and largely no doubt because of the current attention to magical practices and other harmful superstitions, he avoided metaphysical and speculative subjects. Little could be known of them and they diverted attention from more important issues or were misleading panaceas for ills which must either be stoically endured or avoided by processes of moral education.

None the less he was himself profoundly, if unostentatiously, and—it might almost be said—unavoidably, religious. 'Heaven has entrusted me with a mission, what can my enemies do to my life?' He had found in the teaching of the ancients an assured conviction of the moral order regulating

the universe and guiding men. His consciousness of his own divine mission sustained him in adversity and was a factor in producing the fresh spiritual energies which broke into the life of his people through him and have been frequently renewed by his disciples in subsequent ages. Of the three things which he once said the ideal man should stand in awe of, one was 'the ordinance of Heaven.' He was, on the other hand, reluctant to talk about God, immortality and unseen spiritual issues generally. He undoubtedly felt his ignorance, and confined his teaching within the limits of human behaviour, concerning which he felt sure of himself and found his real interest. But many Chinese of to-day do not regard him as agnostic in the western sense of being in consequence irreligious. They point out that while reticent on the subject he never denied the existence of God but rather took it for granted. In quiet moments thoughts of spiritual influences outside of human nature stirred within him: 'How surpassing great are the powers of the spirits. Looking, we cannot see them; listening, we do not hear them; yet they enter into all things, and there is nothing without them.'

That he was neither free from faults nor possessed of all wisdom he himself freely recognized. The eulogies of later ages according to him divine attributes and the worship in temples dedicated to his memory are chiefly of interest as indicating how powerful has been his influence and how constant have been the moral enthusiasm and irrepressible religious impulses of Chinese scholars. It is not pertinent to the purpose of this paper to debate his shortcomings. The occasion for bearing witness to Christian faith in China rests on absolute considera-

tions, and is not worthily strengthened by criticizing one of the noblest teachers the world has known.

III. THE EFFECTS OF THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF CONFUCIUS ON CHINESE CHARACTER

It is by no means easy to estimate the extent to which Chinese habits have been affected by Confucius as against the extent to which he incarnates the distinctive characteristics of his race. Nor is it important for our present study to differentiate between Confucius as himself the effect of the socially inherited opinions and observances of his race, and as the cause which has moulded their thinking and fixed their customs through the subsequent centuries. Chinese civilization as it actually exists to-day is in either case the same. Confucius claimed, however, to be only a transmitter of the lore of the ancients, and may not unfairly be regarded as the pre-eminent teacher who interpreted, exemplified and gave logical consistency to the forms in which the concepts of his race had long been crystallizing. That, despite many controversies, the essential content of his teaching has been reaffirmed by the greatest thinkers of successive schools of thought, and colours even now the reactions of unlettered peasants and modernized young intellectuals, is evidence of how truly he expressed the genius of his people.

The Confucian system of thought has been admirably summarized by Dr D. Willard Lyon: 'He taught that man must learn to live in harmonious relations with his fellow-men; that the basic unit in maintaining such relations must be the family; that the principles which underlie successful relations

in the family must also be applied in the larger relations of life; that morality presupposes a moral order in the universe, which, though we know little of it, underlies all our human relations; that to be kept stable, society must have leaders who can be trusted; that the only leaders to be trusted are men of character; that character is to be developed both through education acquired from others and through self-discipline; that no man is a safe leader who goes to extremes; that the right cultivation of his own character for the sake of society must be the chief concern of every leader; that no parent, teacher, or public officer has the right to take lightly his responsibilities for guiding, through precept, rules and example, the conduct of those who are under him.

'Confucianism is generally acknowledged to be a system of social and political ethics; as such it is chiefly concerned in improving the ethical foundations of the State and in fitting the man who holds office to function effectively as a moral leader. The purely metaphysical element, while not lacking, is kept subordinate. Confucianism has not encouraged empty speculation, but has rather emphasized the practical aspects of political and social life. It has sought solutions for the actual problems confronting the ruler, the subordinate official, the teacher and the parent. Such solutions are attempted through clarifying the obligations implied in what are called the five human relations: namely, those existing between ruler and ruled, father and son, brother and brother, husband and wife, friend and friend. So prominent a place have these relations held that many students have come to think of Confucianism as nothing more than an elaborate system of individual and social ethics.'

Confucius stressed as no other great moralist in the world ever has the formal observance of rules of conduct because the inner springs of action would thus be restrained or rightly nurtured. This has tended to foster a barren emphasis on externals, a deadening attention to etiquette, an excessive concern over appearances, popularly described as saving or losing face, and an unthinking acceptance of conventionalized morality. But it has also produced a race to whom courtesy is instinctive and the lack of it immoral, who have learned better perhaps than any other the fine art of living together, whose established sanctions have undoubtedly contributed in no slight measure to their high level of social conduct and their endurance as a nation. To the Chinese the way in which a thing is done is usually of far more consequence than the thing that is done. Much in our manner of life must seem to them not only uncouth but inconsiderate and therefore wrong. Even hypocrisy and prevarication are often justified by them as necessary in order to preserve the obviously more important duty of saving face or of avoiding rudely causing pain. How to escape the insincerities, the morality of standardized externals and the baffling sense of unreality which such an attitude creates, while retaining the gracious amenities of mutual intercourse, is one of the problems for the present generation.

Economics and morals are alike involved in the bearing of custom on the costliness of marriage and funeral ceremonies, social and filial obligations, family claims in conflict with those of public service, or integrity in government office.

It may be confidently asserted that no literature in the world is more free from allusions to sex, more

wholesome and elevating in its treatment of relations between men and women, than the Chinese classics. The position accorded women has been more dull but less degrading than is generally supposed. Whether polygamy and concubinage were the best working compromise with masculine appetite in a Confucianized environment is a question that new currents of thought are now provoking, but its prevalence illustrates the tendency to compromise with the facts of existence which is characteristic of Chinese pragmatism. That it has been impotent to eradicate from the masses impurity of thought is evident to any one familiar with the obscenities of the language of abuse. But far more serious is the spread of venereal disease, salacious literature, commercialized vice, radical theories of sex, largely because of contact with the West, in a culture where the ancient standards have been an ineffective antidote.

Confucianism is cursed to-day, by ardent reformers, as the bulwark of conservatism and the barrier to enlightened progress. It is blamed for many of the evils most hateful to young China—absolute monarchy, intellectual bigotry, moral hypocrisy, concubinage, burdensome social requirements. That Confucius himself frankly looked backward to the past for inspiration and imitation may have been due to historical causes or to temperament, but his own example has—not without notable instances of resurgent intellectual vitality—made, on the whole, for a cautious and formalized regimentation alike of thought and practice which is incompatible with modern demands. Many neo-Confucianists, however, while frankly recognizing this, are none the less convinced that the essential prin-

ciples of their master can be adapted with renewed power to the needs of the present. A Christian Chinese student of philosophy has put it thus: 'Some students have condemned Chinese classical literature as dead and aristocratic, not knowing that both its form and content contain elements which possess permanent value not only for China, but for the rest of the world as well. It is an important task of Chinese education to produce scholars who are able to effect a real synthesis, not an external amalgamation, of old and new values, thus creating a genuinely new culture, which, while taking in the best in the new, remains also true to Chinese genius.' This synthesis must, he added, be one 'that will harmonize personal and moral culture with social service, industrial efficiency and the study of science.'

In this review of the effect of Confucian culture on Chinese character there is the danger of over-estimating this particular influence, or of idealizing a social structure as seen in its literature or in the advocacy of its exponents. But it is a remarkable fact that, although learning has been limited to those who had the capacity and the leisure to master a written language difficult because of its ideographic nature, yet the moral discipline it urged has permeated the whole mass. This, at least largely, accounts for their patient cheerfulness and uncomplaining resignation, their tolerance and kindliness, their easy adjustment to human and physical environment, their respect for age and for the man of learning, their fine loyalties in established relationships, even their persistence through centuries and their fecundity as a race. With a patriarchal monarchy they have long had local self-government and social

democracy. Mencius taught that the people had the right to rebel against an unworthy ruler, and they have repeatedly exerted it in issues local or national, notably in and since the revolution against the Manchu Dynasty. This explains why public opinion has been and is now so powerful in a nation without effective political organization or military power.

The really predominant quality of the Chinese race is, however, its interest in moral conduct. We need not ignore the failings and vices which have revealed themselves throughout their long history, nor the degrading realities in the China of to-day, to acknowledge that more than any other race they have specialized in the mutual relations of mankind. Nature has been studied not for material benefit but to bring human life into harmony with the cosmic order. Hence the lack of progress in the physical sciences and that quality in their art which is unconcerned with accurate reproduction of actual landscapes but is for ever disclosing the spirit of mountains and streams, of flowers and birds, in terms of the moods of the soul. Confucius gathered up and reaffirmed the lessons from the ancients in a few simple categories of human virtue, and the great literature since produced has been almost entirely occupied with continuing such discussions. The result is that Chinese of all classes—whatever their personal morals—have a capacity for evaluating human motives and actions that is unsurpassed. Despite the recent influx of new attractions from foreign lands this still remains their supreme interest. Young intellectuals are now in a mood of negative criticism of other persons or groups, but it all centres on moral issues, and while often caustic and cynical, it is always shrewd. The irony of the present dis-

tress in China is that her international humiliation, her political corruption, her economic wretchedness, her social deterioration and her mass illiteracy, are all fundamentally moral issues, easily to be overcome under a moralized leadership, whereas no people have ever appreciated with clearer insight the importance of character, especially in their leaders, as the true source of prosperity and stable government.

IV. CONFUCIANISM AS A RELIGION

The question whether Confucianism is, or is not, a religion has frequently been discussed by western students and is now becoming of interest to some Chinese. The answer depends, of course, on the definition of religion. A distinction must also be observed between the religious concepts or emotions of Confucius himself and the teachings of the School. It is further to be remembered that the Chinese temperament is not analytical, as is ours of the West, and has never divided life into rigidly labelled compartments. Religion, in so far as they concern themselves with it at all, is felt by them to pervade all human affairs and to be one aspect of reality or man's attitude to it, rather than a particular system of belief based on certain historical occurrences or philosophical reasonings, with their consequent observances and obligations, formulated with precision, and segregated—at least in popular usage—from other interests of life. This explains the anomaly, so puzzling to our departmentalized habits of thought, that not only have the three religions of China, Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, lived

happily together for many centuries (with brief lapses of imperially commanded intolerance), but countless individual Chinese have practised the rites of each or all as occasion required with no consciousness of incongruity. All three assume the *Tao*, or creating and controlling Way of the Universe, and the impersonal Ultimate from which all things are born, and they respectively meet the varying needs of men to be taken, like medicine, as needed.

There is undeniably a religious element in Confucianism, more pronounced in the earlier writings, less so in the doctrines of Confucius himself. Whatever the cause of his own reticence, the result has been religious degeneration into a cult for the learned, surviving in an agnostic and therefore hungrily superstitious world. The God-idea of the classics, in many ways so noble, instead of being clarified, grew vague and chilly, dwindling into the ambiguous term *T'ien* or Heaven, which by the time of Chu Hsi and the Sung Dynasty had become merely the depersonalized moral principle of nature. This ancient conception of *Shang Ti*, or the Supreme Ruler, thus failed to extricate itself from the clamant polytheism of the people and to parallel the vitalizing monotheism of the Old Testament. There was, however, one thinker at least in ancient China who conceived quite definitely of a Supreme Being and who argued at length not only that He should be worshipped, but that obedience to Him and imitation of His unrestricted beneficence requires the practice of universal love. It is significant that Motzu (Mo Ti), long regarded as a heretic in orthodox Confucianism, is now being studied with newly awakened attention.

But in the paragraphs of this paper, as in the age-long stretches of Confucian practice, there constantly

recurs its ethical emphasis. If a religion at all, it is a religion of humanism with adumbrations never wholly dissolved from view of spiritual cravings and comforts. Says the *Book of Rites*: 'The practice of right living is deemed the highest art; that of any other is lower. Complete virtue takes first place; the doing of anything else whatever is secondary.' In the glowing insight of Confucius this found supreme expression in *Jen*, which he himself defined as: 'When desiring to stand to enable others to stand; when desiring to attain to enable others to attain.' The Golden Rule taught negatively by him on other occasions here finds positive expression. It reminds one of Pope's couplet, described by Ruskin as being the finest statement of moral purpose in the English language:

> Never elated while one man's oppressed;
> Never dejected while another's blest.

Jen is the one essential attribute of the ideal man. That this consists in love, or fellow-feeling and consequent effort to help, reveals the essentially humanitarian motive of the Confucian ethic. It is reinforced by the word *Shu*, or Reciprocity, which is the negative aspect of *Jen*, and is more subjective in comparing the heart or action of others with one's own, thus prompting to considerate treatment and forgiving tolerance of others. When taken in connexion with his declarations about World Brotherhood (*Ta T'ung*) the splendid breadth of the great humanist compels respect. That his world had narrow geographical bounds does not vitiate the universalism of his concept. As to the unseen realities he is reserved but reverently so. 'God exists, but He remains the Unknowable,' writes a thoughtful Chinese Christian

after questioning a list of typical living scholars. 'This is the creed of Confucianism. The first part makes you glow with pleasant anticipation of the wonderful vistas of spiritual insight that may be opened to you, but the second part slams the door right to and you are face to face with a solid stone wall. This stone wall of agnosticism is more difficult to surmount than open hostility, because the agnostic is always self-satisfied.' And the practical fruition of classical agnosticism in the intelligentsia of to-day is atheism and naturalism freely avowed or practically accepted.

V. ANCESTOR WORSHIP AND WORSHIP OF CONFUCIUS

Ancestor worship is of interest as illustrating in high lights the utilitarian ethic and religious scepticism of Confucianism with their sociological and superstitious consequences. It probably came down from primitive times as the correlate of emphasis on the family and reverence for the aged, perpetuated by dim hopes or fears of immortality. The ceremonies had become grossly materialized, but Confucius felt their social value too highly to be willing to discard them. They served as the bond of union in the social order and were the crowning feature in filial piety, loyalty to the sovereign and other cardinal virtues in the Confucian system. He therefore urged their observance, as in the case of the gods or spirits, as though they were present. Mencius, who apparently did not believe in the existence of spirits, since they are not mentioned in his writings, none the less stressed ritual observances for the dead

even more than did his master. Hsün Tzu sought to eliminate all superstition from the life of scholars, and urged that human nature, though evil, could be educated into goodness. He, more than his predecessors, all of whom agreed as to the goodness of man by nature, felt the moral and social effectiveness of maintaining burial and sacrificial ceremonies, and rationalized the practice by explaining that they were not for the sake of the dead but for the living. For those who understood his interpretation they ceased to have any idolatrous or even religious significance, and as this became widely accepted in subsequent teaching it is not surprising that the Emperor K'ang-hsi literally meant it when he informed the Jesuits at his court that ancestor worship was in no sense a religious rite. To the western missionary, because of its outward forms and the confusion in the use of the word *pai*, which may mean indifferently the paying of respects or the performance of worship, it has always seemed idolatrous, and such it has been in popular effect. But it represents a persistent belief in the immortality of the clan, if not of the individual, and enshrines the sense of the continuity of life with its reciprocal duties. It gratifies the dying wishes of loved ones and gives an outlet for grief. It has preserved the feeling of reverence and the resolution to live worthily of the departed and has been a deterrent to misdoing. The real objection to ancestor worship is that it creates in the minds of the worshippers the value of God for the spirits of the dead, and thus blurs the religious relation which each soul should have to God alone.

The instinct which has led to the worship of Confucius and the rational interpretation of it among the *literati* who have revered him as the glorified spiritual

ancestor of their class is essentially the same. As a matter of fact, popular idolatry springs largely from the same urge. The idols are chiefly ancient sage-kings or hero-patriots, or men, and one woman, who have been benefactors of humanity, notably the Buddha and his disciples. The connexion on the one hand with ancestor worship and on the other with ethical humanism is obvious.

VI. CONFUCIANISTS' DIFFICULTIES IN THEIR APPROACH TO CHRISTIANITY

These develop naturally out of their own racial heritage. The fact that Christianity has come to them in foreign forms of thought and ritual observance has been peculiarly an obstacle to a people whose religion has been so completely integrated with their life. This was aggravated at the outset by their proud ignorance of other lands as it is now by their passionate nationalism. The insistence on theological dogmas which seem to Chinese scepticism difficult of objective proof and to Chinese pragmatism of slight ethical meaning is frequently urged. The emphasis on sin as inherent clashes against their traditional acceptance of the doctrine that human nature is originally good but is corrupted by its contacts, and related to this is the Confucian reliance on self-discipline through education and the beneficial effects of just government and proper social relations as against regenerating influences from a superhuman source. Future reward as an incentive to righteous or religious living is scorned as inferior to the teaching of their own sages that virtue is its own reward. The mystic relation of the soul to

God is regarded by some Chinese Christians as perhaps the greatest obstacle, and to this might be added the more general one of what is in their view a disproportionate absorption with the divine rather than the human aspects of life. The number and variety of denominations and the controversy, rivalry and mutual intolerance among them have proved sorely perplexing. The moral laxity, social injustice, materialism and at least passive acceptance of military force in so-called Christian lands, are the subject of humiliating comment. Modern science has given a new assurance to the ancient rationalism of China in regard to the miraculous elements in the Scriptures and the deity of Jesus, to say nothing of the validity of any religious experience. The apparent lack of filial respect on the part of Jesus, especially in His treatment of His mother at Cana of Galilee, has a force that only Chinese can feel. They fear the obscurantist attitude to scientific thought and to social reforms, the bitterness of theological controversy and the readiness of Christians to go to war even against one another, which they are taught to believe from the history of Europe and America is inescapable in institutionalized Christianity.

VII. POINTS OF CONTACT

Confucianism assumes that there is a Supreme Power, orderly and beneficent, which controls the universe and the destiny of man. There is a real if not commonly felt causal connexion between this belief and the basic relationship in the Confucian ethic, between that of father and son. The distinctive note in the revelation of Jesus is the

Fatherhood of God and the consequent meaning of this for men. As Mr E. R. Hughes has put it :

'Of all the religions there are only two at the heart of which lies the principle of filial piety. One of these is Confucianism ; the other is Christianity. Of the former the unprejudiced observer has to admit that, however out of perspective it may be, it is yet extraordinarily near to the truth of the matter. Its founders may, as Dr Hu Shih convincingly shows, have been false to their great master. In that case, whilst what they builded may have been worse than they knew, yet most certainly it was also better. Behind the relation of parent and child lies the creation of human life, the given fact of the family, at once homely and mysterious. Most religions, if not all, show that behind them lies a response to this fact. But in the case of other religions so often it was the marital relation which intrigued men's interest ; so much so that often enough religion has been pander to lust. The Confucianist would have none of this, though he knew the meaning of romance (cf. *The Book of Poetry*). He was after something more permanent, more trustworthy, than sex passion could give him. Therefore the child had to come in. Again, worship of motherhood has led some people along the path of gynæolatry. The Confucianist went beyond that. The mother had her place as deity, but that place was alongside the father. Remember, too, that behind and beyond the family was Heaven and that dim figure, *Shang Ti*. So Confucianism dug its roots into the concrete reality in and behind the universe. It may be accused of making man in the image of God ; yet there is much to be said for the argument that this was one stage nearer the

truth of it all than making God in the image of man.'

What is of the very essence of the teaching of Jesus, however, and the only possible explanation of His own life, the presence and power of the fatherly God, is at most shadowy and remote suggestion with Confucius. In testifying to the elements Christianity can contribute to Confucianism, Chinese Christians usually mention first a clearer, completer knowledge of God from personal experience. One of the oldest living Christians who had in his youth mastered the classical scholarship goes so far as to say that 'Confucianism contains all the essential ideas of Christianity except the idea of God.' Or as a younger one states the difference: 'Confucian ethics has a naturalistic basis. To Christianize China is to change the very basis of its morality, to substitute a personal God, the Father of Jesus and of all men, for the impersonal, and at the best, pantheistic nature. In other words, the problem is, how to give Chinese morality a new soul.'

It is probably fair to summarize the views of Chinese Christians as to the Confucian concept of God by saying that while inadequate it is not incompatible with the Christian one, and that the underlying assumptions about Heaven and *Shang Ti* can be enriched and vitalized until they connote the Heavenly Father of Jesus.

Confucianism and Christianity are at one in recognizing the primary importance of personal character, and in each instance the master himself has ever been the best example of his own teaching. Not only so but each has defined character in terms of man's relation to his fellows. The Gospel of Christ will commend itself to the Chinese mind in so far as

it furnishes fresh inspiration and potency to ethical ideals. Islam and Brahmanism may have emphasized religion at the expense of righteousness. The Chinese are religiously indifferent but ethically alert. They think in terms of man, not of God ; of cosmic processes, not of personal deity. Religious ceremonial is only of use in the social control of the unenlightened masses. If, therefore, they can discover in the Christian doctrine of God and in union with Him through spiritual culture an unmistakable and hitherto unknown dynamic for right living, they will accept it in terms that they best understand.

It may seem that Confucianism as based on philosophical materialism must repudiate the spiritual elements in the Christian ethic. As a matter of fact, not a few of them fear the impact of western materialism upon a civilization from which the ancient sanctions have largely perished, and seek new spiritual energies with which to rescue and reinvigorate their treasured heritage. The two following quotations from President Lim Boom Keng, of Amoy University, are illuminating as evidence that Chinese are not forced into conflicting camps by verbal antitheses, but will claim as allies any who strive for the same objectives whatever their philosophy :

' The Confucianists are endeavouring to restate the case for Confucianism in the light of modern knowledge. In this renaissance Confucianism finds itself happily in a much sounder position than that of any other religion. (1) Its theology is purely rationalistic and is not vitiated by any obsolete creed based on any alleged revelation. (2) Its system of ethics is founded primarily on the fundamental relations of mankind, and is wholly deduced from the

principles of filial piety and altruism, subject to revision at any time by altered political or intellectual conditions. (3) It recognizes the need of science in the furtherance of knowledge. (4) It bases its philosophy entirely upon reason and logic. (5) Its politics is the application of the law of love for the government of mankind, and is not inconsistent with all the demands of the new democracy. Thus neo-Confucianism, despite its temporary set-back through the fall of Mandarin Classicism, is a clear advance, and may claim to be the kind of religion most suitable to our age, not only in China but throughout the world. It is socialistic and democratic, without being too idealistic, and yet it combines a sane pragmatism with an absolute conviction in the truth of the Immanence of the Divine Spirit in the world.'

'Is it not possible for the Christian missions, with their prestige, their influence, their wealth and their opportunities, to take part in this mighty work of reconciliation, and to save the wreckage of the oldest human civilization from the ravages of a cruel and senseless nihilistic revolution, that respects neither man nor God ?'

VIII. THE HEART OF THE MATTER

The incentive to Christian missionary enterprise is personal experience of Jesus Christ and the conviction that a similar experience is possible for men of all races and will result for them in essentially the same ethical and spiritual benefits. From the nature of the case this missionary impulse can be appreciated only by those who have shared in the experience. But for all such it has absolute values.

We welcome all the spiritual intuition or ethical enthusiasm that may have come through any of the world's great seers or sages as part of 'the light that lighteth every man coming into the world.' We seek to blend the Christian experience with any such racial heritage, believing that the resultant gain to all will be the greater. We well know that the revelation of God through Christ is sublimely satisfying and sufficient, but we gladly if humbly anticipate that the special emphases of oriental culture will bring fresh understanding of Him and help us to correct or supplement our own incomplete appreciation of His transcending greatness. It might once have seemed that Confucian China had its own solution of life's moral and religious problems and needed nothing from us. Even then the love that experience of Christ ought to generate would demand that we share, in the spirit of unselfish service, the best of all that we have to give with the people of China in this their time of crucial need, trusting that by such efforts some of them may become convinced of the transforming power of Christian faith and seek in turn to share it with their fellows. But this need no longer be the appeal. This paper has been written not from theory nor even in the main from western experience. Most of the comments on Confucian culture, especially as related to the Christian evangel, have been learned from Chinese Christians, whose sense of its superlative importance for their own people is made more joyous and convincing because of their experience alike of Confucian ideals and of Christian realities. Their radiant testimony has coloured all that is written in these pages and constitutes for the writer the most enlightening and exhilarating inducement to continued missionary

service. The following self-revelation in a personal letter written by one of them within the past few months is a comforting evidence of the receptivity to Christian influences of Chinese saturated with Confucian idealism:

'We have been hearing, not perhaps without a measure of patience, that we must interpret Christianity in terms of Chinese culture. There is a good deal in it. But what we really need is a thorough understanding of the teachings of Jesus, and a direct experience of Christ, through a living of His kind of life. The Christian message is clearly far above what Confucius can offer and what his followers can give. Mankind wants God. My personal opinion is that God can be found in clear expression only in the Lord incarnate, our Lord Jesus Christ. The greatest task ahead, it seems to me, is a creating of the direct experience of God through our faith in Christ. The Christian message lies clearly in the definite faith in God as Father, with whom His believing children can have personal communion through the living of a life as exemplified in Jesus, a life of moving and conquering love. It is clear that Confucius has not given us a gospel, a simple yet magnificent gospel, of the love of God the Father, who wants us all to be like Christ, and to have the most abundant life, that contains in it a wonderful peace and joy and a contact with everlasting reality.'

Another wrote as follows shortly before his death: 'My opinion is that if Christianity . . . is to be naturalized in China, its forms, organizations and theologies must undergo a thorough modification and correction. . . . But when we take the teachings of Christ and His life and view them in their totality we find in them eternal values. He lived and was

merciful and sympathetic, suffering for those that suffer, and, as He was nailed upon the cross, dying for mankind, His compassionate and sorrowing love went deeply into the heart of man. His dying prayer was a petition to God to forgive His enemies, manifesting a broad toleration which has since been the source of man's inspiration. Such a romantic spirit met a need and supplemented the prevalent Greek civilization, and in our own time and country not only compares favourably with love and benevolence as taught by Mo Ti, Mencius, Confucius and the philosophers of the Sung and the Ming dynasties, but also fulfils their teachings and extends it to practical affairs. . . . Most of our people are selfish and so there are exceeding few who pay any attention to the social welfare. There are even people who cover up their selfishness, calculating and fighting their fellow-men in their thoughts and disguising their dangerous and poisonous spirit in the cloak of respectability. They virtually cut their life off from the life of others. Nothing but compassionate and pitying love can save us from such a state of affairs and from such a type of life. And such a love is the sole and absolute contribution of the Christian religion.'

The Confucian literature can nobly supplement the Old Testament in leading its students to Christ and helping them to interpret Him according to their racial genius, as Plato did for the Græco-Roman world. Even for the western mind it brings renewed confidence in the supremacy of the One who in the midst of bitter contradictions moved steadily on in His unshaken confidence that at the heart of things reigns Love and that Love will triumph in the end. In the strength of His example we have the courage to trust the reality of His faith, and to look up, as did

He, to find the face of God. In the Cross of Christ we see revealed the very heart of the Eternal and we know the secret of the universe. The sages of China had intimations of such mysteries and lived bravely in their sustaining light. But no other person of whom history tells can help men to such an adventure of faith with its confirming experience as He has helped them. He leads us to God and in ethical perfection incarnate, such as the Chinese should of all men best appreciate, He reveals the qualities of the unseen God and the scarcely less dimly recognized potentialities of human nature when quickened by His Spirit. The Chinese tradition fits them peculiarly to appropriate Him to themselves. In their troubled ferment of change they need the very potencies which He lived and died that men might have. The plant is already taking root in the rich soil of Chinese intellectual and ethical inheritance, but it is very tender and slight. It must be carefully nurtured and reproduced throughout that vast population. In considerations such as these lies the quivering challenge to serve with better methods learned by contact, and in ways that make for the highest welfare, the race that produced and has ever since reverenced Confucius.

RELIGIOUS VALUES IN CONFUCIANISM[1]

Rev. D. Willard Lyon, D.D.—Editor

I. THE BACKGROUND

Meaning of the Term 'Confucianism'

'CONFUCIANISM is that body of teachings culled by Confucius from the more ancient sages of China, which was commended and enforced by his teaching and example, handed down by his immediate disciples, consolidated by Mencius, and cast into its present form by Chu Hsi, and which has ever since been the orthodoxy of the race. It is spoken of both as a religion and a philosophy.'—S. Couling's *Encyclopædia Sinica.*

'The Confucianism of to-day is the resultant of all the cultural influences which have been at work throughout the ages. It is the experience of a race that has lived long. Like a great river it has continued its fructifying flow through every age and every phase of Chinese life. It has gathered soil from hillsides widely separated in time and space and has left its rich deposits in unexpected places throughout the years. It has been, and in great measure still is, China's way of life.'—D. Willard Lyon, in an unpublished manuscript.

[1] This paper, as distributed before the Jerusalem Meeting, contained a number of other quotations which are not reprinted here because of the limitations of space in this volume.—Editor.

Was Confucius interested in Religion?

'Confucius was pre-eminently a moralist. His interests were this-worldly. He had no taste for metaphysical speculation or religious contemplation. Excepting the one reference to his desire for the study of the mysteries in the Book of Changes, he consistently devoted himself to the study and solution of the practical problems of human relationships, and the teaching of right conduct. He showed no curiosity for the mysterious and unknown, and discouraged his disciples in their efforts to understand those things. . . . In his private life, he showed strong faith in the Providence of Heaven giving him his allotted life and work on earth, and protecting him against the evil designs of his enemies. On two occasions he used the highly religious words, "Heaven has entrusted me with a mission; what can my enemies do to my life?" Furthermore, sometimes in his quiet hours he did allow questionings about the "other world" to trouble his mind. "How surpassing great are the powers of the spirits. Looking, we cannot see them; listening, we do not hear them; yet they enter into all things, and there is nothing without them." But whatever his private religious views, Confucius in his public life as teacher was an agnostic and positivist.'—Y. Y. Tsu, in *The Chinese Recorder*, May 1919.

'Had Confucius been interested in religion, he would have attempted to reform the existing religion. This he made no attempt to do. His interests lay in political reform. He was an ethical and a political teacher.'—Francis C. M. Wei, in an interview.

'Confucius is not, though he seems to be, anything of an agnostic; instead of being indifferent towards divinity, his attitude is rather reserved, as he sees clearly that the knowledge of divinity is beyond the power of human understanding. Evidence to prove Confucius' belief in a personal God is not lacking in the Classics. When he was distressed by political disturbances or other unhappy events, he used to comfort himself by saying that he was born of Heaven, and that Heaven produced the virtue that was in him. He had the fullest confidence in Heaven, against which he never murmured, just as he did not grumble against men. Once he told his disciples that there were three things of which the ideal man stood in awe. The "ordinance of Heaven" was one of the three.'—C. Y. Hsü, in *The Philosophy of Confucius.*

To what Extent has Confucianism been regarded as a Religion?

'Whether Confucianism is a religion or not depends on how we define religion. If we take religion to be life in its totality, then Confucianism is 99 per cent religion. If we take religion to be "a faith arising out of the human sense of dependence, a recognition of the existence of God, and an effort to secure the comforts and stimulants of life through direct communication with God," as Mr Hsü Hsinch'eng puts it, then Confucianism is not a religion at all. I would call Confucianism a specific way of living, instead of a religion, although it does serve the purpose of a religion if the end of religion is to help one to be in harmony with nature and men and to save men from selfishness through losing

their lives in the love of their fellow-men.'—Bingham Dai, in a letter dated 29th August 1927.

'Confucius, through his strong personality, his conservation and his assumption of the rôle of champion of ancient culture, was able to win Chinese thought to his standard, and to make his school the orthodox and the rival schools heretical. Henceforth Confucianism reigned supreme. As far as the religious development of the nation was concerned, this victory of Confucianism was a decided set-back, for the spirit of Confucianism, after its founder, was sceptical and unfavourable for religious growth. . . . The God-idea of the Classics, instead of being clarified, grew dim and vague in the atmosphere of Confucianism, and finally, in the ambiguous term, *T'ien*, it became no more than an impersonal moral principle or law of the universe.'—Y. Y. Tsu, in *The Chinese Recorder*, May 1919.

'There is in Confucianism a religious element, more pronounced in the ancient books, less prominent in the teaching of Confucius himself. There may be some explanation of his reserve as being a revulsion from increasing superstition, but the result has been unfortunate. He has helped to set up in Confucianism, religiously, an unstable equilibrium, a religious degeneration, so that the religious element of the earlier books has dwindled intellectually into a philosophy, and practically into a mere state cult surviving in an agnostic or superstitious world. The ancient conception of *Shang Ti*, in many ways so worthy, failed to extricate itself from its polytheistic concomitants and to become a vitalizing monotheism such as we have in the Old Testament. Nor has Confucianism within itself any hope of such a develop-

ment now. At best, then, what can be hoped for is an ethic wonderfully high in theory, not inert, either, in practice, still of value as guide and restraint, but lacking that enthusiasm without which virtue is neither safe nor aggressive. This lack the Confucian ethic cannot supply, for it rests on an agnostic basis, or at least with no sanction even remotely religious other than the thought that right conduct is in accordance with the principle of things.'—Dr P. J. Maclagan, in *The International Review of Missions*, April 1914.

'Most foreign critics, and some Chinese, deny that it [Confucianism] is a religion; and as it discourages all belief in a personal God, does not use prayer except to inform the spirits of important events and leaves personal immortality out of its scheme, except in so far as ancestral rites are concerned, Confucianism can hardly be called a religion in the western sense of the word.'—S. Couling's *Encyclopædia Sinica*.

'Confucianism has always fostered the fear of Heaven and the worship of departed spirits. In spite of the fact that Confucius was quite reticent in expressing himself regarding the spirit world, the future life and God, his followers throughout the centuries have continued to act as if they believed in a Supreme Being and the reality of the Unseen. Their belief in predestination has been so universal and dominating that it has amounted to fatalism. . . . Whatever name may be given to the Supreme Force, there is a basic assumption that the Will of this Force cannot be circumvented. Furthermore, the worship of the spirits of the dead, which has not been wholly destroyed by the encroachments of modern science, is another element in Confucian practice which is

clearly religious.'—D. Willard Lyon, in an unpublished manuscript.

'In so far as *Ju Chiao* is religious, it has permeated all life. It has not segregated religion from the rest of life. And there is no priestly caste in *Ju Chiao*. The Chinese have been, and still are, just as religious as any primitive people. And their religion is not so separated from the rest of life as is the case with more highly developed civilizations. It permeates all life and is not a separate institution.'—Francis C. M. Wei, in an interview.

'Regarded from its outward form, Confucianism appears to be a religion; but, while religion deals mostly with spiritual conceptions, Confucianism is rightly regarded as a moral system, clearly distinguished from religion.'—T. Inouye, in *Fifty Years of New Japan*, edited by Count S. Okuma.

II. PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING CONFUCIANISM

The Way of Nature, or *Tao*

'The basic philosophy of Confucius is *Tao*. . . . *Tao* is the starting-point. It is the road or way in which the universe moves. It is the order of the world, or natural order. It is the way that ought to be pursued by all men. It is the moral course for every man. . . . *Tao* is the natural course of the universe. There is the course of Heaven, which is called *T'ien Tao*, there is the course of earth, which is called *Ti Tao*, and last, but most important, there is *Jen Tao*, or the Tao of Man.'—R. Y. Lo, in *The Chinese Recorder*, January 1923.

'The term *Tao* . . . is called a road from the fact that it is a universal law common to all the ages as distinguished from *li*, the law of individual existence. . . . But it is an invisible road; the evidence of its existence is to be found in men's actions. In other words, it is the hidden moral principle from which proceed the common virtues of everyday life, the Moral Law followed by all men in all ages.'—J. Percy Bruce, in *Chu Hsi and His Masters*.

The Moral Constancy of Nature

'Heaven and earth have manifested a moral constancy in their uniform ways. The Universe is a system and not chaos. In all the works of nature is found an exhibition of sincerity which, in turn, ought to be the starting-point of a moral life.'—T. C. Chao, in *The Chinese Recorder*, May 1918.

'There is in Confucianism, as indeed there is in the tradition that is older than Confucius and which he transmitted in systematized form, the basic conception that nature herself is good, and prescribes principles and rules for the right conduct of humans. The course of nature is mysterious enough, to be sure; its ways are literally past finding out. There is, therefore, in the practice of men a fatalistic submission to its decrees. Human fortune and misfortune, human happiness and human disaster are "ordained"; and since as yet there is no science giving rise to the idea of mastery and control of natural events, they are literally inevitable. But these inevitable "appointments" of nature, however harsh or severe they may seem, are felt to depend upon the behaviour of humans. Nature is not at bottom bad. She is simply just and

requites good with good and evil with evil. . . . Nature is moral and acts in a moral way.'—William S. A. Pott, in *Chinese Political Philosophy.*

Man's Natural Tendency to be Good

'The tendency of man's nature to good may be likened to water flowing downwards.'—*Mencius*, VI, ii, 2; translation by Monlin Chiang.

'Along with the basic view of nature as good, there is in Confucianism the equally basic view that human nature is good. Under the ancient system of education that is only beginning to be superseded by something more modern. The first book that was placed in the hands of the young Chinese student was a book called the *Trimetrical Classic*, compiled in the eleventh century of our era. . . . The opening line of this curious little volume, which the Chinese student knows far better than the western youth knows his Sunday-school stories, reads as follows: "Men at their birth are by nature radically good." . . . Very early in life, then, the mind of the Chinese child is indoctrinated with this basic point of view.'—William S. A. Pott, in *Chinese Political Philosophy.*

'Mencius maintains that every man possesses within himself a principle of benevolence, which induces him to pity and help others; a principle of justice, which induces him to be ashamed of that which is shameful in himself and to hate that which is hateful in another; a principle of propriety, which induces him to respect and reverence those to whom respect and reverence are due; and a principle of wisdom, by which he may know and

approve the right on the one hand, and know and disapprove the wrong on the other. This latter principle . . . like the other three, according to Mencius, is not superinduced upon human nature, but is innate and essential to it. . . . Mencius maintains that a man has but to obey the law in himself to be perfect.'—T. Genähr, in *The Chinese Recorder*, October 1911.

'It is important to observe that the goodness of human nature which Mencius affirms is, to begin with, potential rather than actual. "Men possess a moral nature; but if they are well fed, warmly clad and comfortably lodged, without being taught at the same time, they become almost like the beasts." . . . The great end of learning is to recover the lost mind, and to have lost their mind is at least the common condition of men.'—P. J. Maclagan, in *Chinese Religious Ideas.*

III. SOME BASIC CONCEPTS IN CONFUCIANISM

LI, OR PROPRIETY

This term has been translated as 'propriety,' 'good form,' 'ritual,' 'ceremony,' 'decorum,' 'appropriate procedure,' and even as 'civilization' or 'culture.'

'A characteristic [of Chinese culture] is the emphasis on *Li*, or "good form." Sometimes the name etiquette, politeness or reverence is given to this item. It is one of the distinctive features of the Confucian system. . . . For each of the essential relationships Confucius developed a system of

standards, habits by which they could be adjusted. Training in these habits of relationship has been without question one of the great stabilizing forces of China. The fine courtesy which characterizes all these people springs from these habits. The poise with which they meet any situation in life comes from an inner preparedness almost instinctive. It is not so much the system of outward relation as of inward preparedness through long training. No books of etiquette are needed in China, because the practice of good form has been inculcated from the beginning of the child's training. Poise and courtesy have become second nature. There is a lack of vulgarity, a refinement of conduct to be felt even in the most uneducated Chinese.'—Lucius C. Porter, in *The Life*, July 1925.

Ch'eng, or Harmony with Nature

Underlying Confucian thought is the concept that man's highest good lies in bringing himself into harmony with the Way of Nature, or *Tao*. This quality of harmony is called *Ch'eng*. It is most clearly set forth in the third of the *Four Books*, commonly known as *The Doctrine of the Mean*.

'Harmony is the way of nature. To attain harmony is the way of man. He who is in harmony with nature hits the mark without effort and apprehends the truth without thinking. He is the sage who naturally and easily embodies the right way.' —*Doctrine of the Mean*, xx. 18; translation based on James Legge, revised by Francis C. M. Wei.

'*Ch'eng* is translated by most Sinologues as "sincerity," but the idea may best be rendered by the

English expression " harmony with, or conformity to, nature or the universe." This is the basic element in the Confucian morality. *Ch'eng* manifests itself in man as *Jen*, which may be translated Perfect Humanity. *Jen* is the underlying motive which finds expression in both character and conduct. In character it is called *I*, or Right Attitude ; in conduct it is called *Li*, or Appropriate Procedure. Since *Ch'eng* is harmony with Nature, and underlies all Chinese ethics, it follows that at bottom the Chinese conception of morality is naturalistic.'—Francis C. M. Wei, in an interview.

' The Doctrine of the Mean stressed formality less and sincerity more. . . . Man is endowed with a virtuous nature. To be sincere means to act in accordance with this nature. Such a man is pursuing the " course of the mean " and his actions will be well balanced.'—C. S. Miao, in an unpublished manuscript.

Chung, or Loyalty

Out of fifteen passages in *The Analects* in which the word *Chung* occurs, Soothill translates it once as ' sincere,' three times as ' loyalty,' and eleven times as ' conscientious,' ' conscientiously,' or ' conscientiousness.' In the same passages Legge uses ' faithful,' ' faithfully,' or ' faithfulness ' six times, ' sincere ' twice, ' loyal ' or ' loyalty ' twice, and each of the following translations once : ' strictly sincere,' ' honourable,' ' devotion of soul,' ' undeviating consistency,' and ' to be true to the principles of our nature.' Ku Hung-ming seems usually to prefer ' conscientiousness,' or ' the inner law of self-control.'

Shu, or Thoughtfulness for Others

'Tzŭ Kung asked, Is there some single word which I may take as the rule of conduct throughout life? The master said, Is not *Shu* the word? What you would not wish done to yourself never do to others.' —*The Analects*, xv. 23; translation by D. Willard Lyon.

'*Shu* is the negative aspect of the love of fellow-man, while *Jen* is its positive aspect. . . . The word *Shu* is made up of the two words for "compare" and "hearts." It represents the idea of judging another by one's own experience. Only as there is similarity in thought-life can one judge another. If I do to a dog or a horse what I would not wish done to myself, I have no way of judging that it may not be what the dog or horse greatly desires. Since I am a man, and my fellow human being is also a man, when I experience what causes me pain, I thereby know that if he experiences the same thing he will suffer pain like mine. Taking my heart as the basis of comparison, I judge him and do not do to him what I could not wish done to myself. Thus does the negative aspect of sympathy come into action. Mencius said, "In the pursuit of *Jen* you come very close to it, by laying hold on *Shu* and putting it into practice." . . . One distinction between *Shu* and *Jen* is this: *Shu* starts with what we would not wish done to ourselves, while *Jen* begins with what we would wish done to ourselves.'—Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, in *Political Ideas of the Pre-Chin Period* (Chinese); translation by D. Willard Lyon.

'The meaning of *Shu* is very near to "forgiveness"; you are considerate of others because you realize that

you too are weak, and capable of falling short, just as they have done.'—Francis C. M. Wei, in an interview.

Chüntzŭ, or the True Gentleman

'The law of the gentleman begins with the recognition of husband and wife; but in its utmost reaches it reigns and rules supreme over heaven and earth.' —Confucius in *The Analects*, xii. 4; translation by Ku Hung-ming, in *The Spirit of the Chinese People*.

'Chüntzu . . . might be translated "princely man." It has much the same meaning as "gentleman" in the best sense of that term. It is a term connoting a man of perfected virtue, i.e. one who has raised himself to that standard. Another interpretation is, a man of outstanding talents and virtue; it is the opposite of a petty or narrow-minded man, a common fellow.'—W. E. Soothill, in *The Analects of Confucius*.

Jen, or the Sum of the Qualities which make a True Gentleman

'*Jen* has been variously translated as "benevolence," "humanity," "altruism," "ethical love," "spirit," "unselfishness" and "love."'

'The central term, *Jen*, or "benevolence," in Confucianism expresses the same idea as the word "humanity," which is to-day the goal of mankind.' —T. Inouye, in *Fifty Years of New Japan*, vol. ii.

'The most difficult problem of our daily life is that of the relation of the individual to others in the group. . . . Confucius in his emphasis on human affairs understood this; therefore he considered *Jen*, or ethical love, to be the final goal of human

life. He said, " The princely man does not act contrary to *Jen*, even during the course of a single meal, or when he is hurried, or when he fails." '— Hsü Hsin-ch'eng, in *The Philosophy of Life* (Chinese); translation by Frank R. Millican.

' In both its ethical and its political doctrines the Confucian school has its roots deeply planted in *Jen*. . . . What is *Jen*? To put it in the simplest of modern terms it may be interpreted as fellow-feeling. " When Fan Ch'ih asked what *Jen* means, the master replied: To love one's fellow-man " (*Analects*, xii. 22); which is to say, to have a fellow-feeling towards human kind. But why do men have a fellow-feeling? Why is fellow-feeling profound only among human beings? Confucius said, " *Jen* means to be a true man "; which makes the concept *Jen* co-extensive with the concept man. To put this, too, into modern language, *Jen* is man expressing his character. Hence, to know what *Jen* is, we must first know what man's nature is.'— Liang Ch'i-Ch'ao, in *Political Ideas of the Pre-Chin Period* (Chinese); translation by D. Willard Lyon.

' *Bushido*, the *noblesse oblige* of the Samurai class, held Benevolence (*Jen*) as the crowning attribute of a noble spirit. . . . I confess I feel a difference, without being able to express it, between Love, as taught by Christ, and Benevolence (*Jen*), upon which the *Bushido* never ceases from insisting. Is it in their intrinsic character? Is it in their degree of intensity? . . . Or is it that one is of Heaven, heavenly, and the other of earth, earthy? I know not how to answer these and other questions arising in quick succession . . . but this I believe: that *Bushido*, grounding itself in the light that

lighteth every man coming into the world, anticipated a more glorious revelation of Love.'—Inazo Nitobé, in *Japan by the Japanese.*

IV. IDEAS IN CONFUCIANISM REGARDING MAN'S SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Man a Responsible Social Being

'Confucius rightly conceives of man as social by nature. He accepts the analysis of the social structure into the five relationships: sovereign and minister, father and son, husband and wife, elder brother and younger, friend and friend. . . . Taking the whole five relationships, then, we learn this, that man is by his very nature involved in a system of relations and only realizes himself in them. Such relations involve difference. Subordination is not a limitation of natural liberty, at best a necessary evil: it is itself natural. Confucius is not so modern as those republican enthusiasts who would build up a social structure from atomistic individuals, each with exactly the same rights as his neighbour.'—P. J. Maclagan, in *The International Review of Missions*, April 1914.

Right Living the Highest Art

'The practice of right living is deemed the highest; the practice of any other art is lower. Complete virtue takes first place; the doing of anything else whatsoever is subordinate.'—*The Book of Rites.*

'What is the supreme good? According to *The Great Learning*, it is defined in accordance with the

duties of the social relation of the individual. As we have seen . . . for a sovereign, the supreme good lies in benevolence; for a minister, in reverence; for a son, in filial piety; for a father, in parental kindness; for the relation with one's fellow-men, in good faith. Therefore in the fulfilment of the social or moral function of man lies the supreme good. Here we find the difference between the Aristotelian idea of *summum bonum* and the Confucian. . . . Aristotle emphasized the rational nature of man; Confucius, his moral nature.'—Monlin Chiang, in *Chinese Principles of Education.*

'There was in Confucius—and it is his outstanding characteristic—an unwavering conviction of the supremacy of virtue. It is to be clung to constantly, even in times of danger. To see what is right and not to do it is cowardice. Riches and honour acquired by unrighteousness are a floating cloud. Righteousness is more to man than fire and water. Even life itself should be sacrificed to preserve one's virtue. Confucius' delineation of the moral ideal may be faulty, but the absoluteness of its imperative is fully acknowledged.'—P. J. Maclagan, in *Chinese Religious Ideas.*

'The ideal goal which Chinese civilization sets before mankind is not unlimited happiness for everybody, which means infinite self-indulgence for everybody, but the complete and perfect "realization of true moral being and moral order in mankind, so that the universe shall become a cosmos, and all things can attain their full growth and development."'—Ku Hung-ming, in *The Conduct of Life.*

'With Confucius, moral self-culture is the essence of morality. The object of moral endeavour is a well-balanced character. . . . Morality is not mere altruism, devotion to public good; it is essentially self-cultivation or self-improvement. Only through self-cultivation can the improvement of society be brought about. The worth of a man's actions is determined by "the sincerity of intentions" and "the rectitude of heart." In short, it is the worth of the agent rather than the effects of an action that should determine all moral judgments. If one overlooks this essential point, one fails to see the fundamental basis in which the whole ethical system of Confucius rests. But what is, according to Confucius, self-cultivation, or what does a well-balanced character consist in? The answer is moderation, inner harmony; or, as he puts it, "to find the true central clue and balance in our moral being."'—K. S. Liu, in *China To-day Through Chinese Eyes.*

The Family the Basic Unit of Social Morality

'The cult of the family was the vital centre of the true Chinese religious life. . . . The ancient culture which found its most perfect expression in the teachings of Confucius provided China with a social organization which was admirably fitted to resist and to last, largely because of its primitive character. The original social unit, the family, was maintained as the group commanding the most respect, with the strongest grip on the loyalties of every one. The individual was only a fraction of the family. The state respected the family and hardly ever

interfered with its life. Business was nearly always a family affair.'—Ph. de Vargas, in *The International Review of Missions*, January 1926.

The State a Larger Family

'As in the family, the sovereign must love his subjects as the father does his children, and the subjects must devote themselves to the sovereign as children do to their father. But if the sovereign does not take an interest in the people or subjects, or acts contrary to the principles of benevolence, the people have the right to take up arms and overthrow him. . . . The people are the master and the sovereign is the honoured servant. If he is benevolent, he is the father of the people; if not, their enemy. "If the sovereign looks upon the people as dust and garlic seeds, the people will look upon him as their common enemy." "Heaven sees through what the people see; Heaven hears through what the people hear." The function of the State is to secure peace, order and prosperity for the people. It exists for the people and not for the sovereign.'—Monlin Chiang, in *Chinese Principles of Education.*

World Brotherhood the Ultimate Goal

'All within the Four Seas are brothers.'—Tzŭ Hsia, in *The Analects*, xii. 5.

'When *Ta T'ung*, or World Brotherhood, becomes effective, all men everywhere will live for the common good; leaders of worth and ability will be selected; their words will be trusted and they will be makers

of peace. Men will not love their own parents to the exclusion of parents of others, nor their own sons to the exclusion of the sons of others. They will provide sustenance to the aged as long as they live, employment to the able-bodied, opportunity for development to the young, friendly care to widows, orphans, childless men and the disabled, for each man a task and for each woman a home. Not wishing to be wasteful of their possessions, they will nevertheless not keep them only for personal use ; as to their strength, not wishing to be inactive, they will on the other hand not exert it in their own behalf alone. Thus evil devices will cease and fail to prosper ; robbers and traitors will be out of work ; and outside doors will not need to be closed ; this will be what we call *Ta T'ung*, or World Brotherhood.'—Confucius, in *The Book of Rites*, vii. 2 ; translation by D. Willard Lyon.

'*Ta T'ung* means a social order in which every individual will have an equal opportunity to share the necessities of existence and to enjoy the good things of life. In man's relations to fellow-man it emphasizes fair dealing, each person having an equal chance under the sun. It presupposes liberty, equality and fraternity, and has as its goal the greatest good for the greatest number. The method for attaining that condition is not by force or aggression, but by moral influence. When one nation has attained that stage then it is her duty to take the next step and help every other nation enjoy the blessings she enjoys. From now on in China any political movement, irrespective of its party affiliations, will probably find it necessary, in order to succeed, to be founded on the principle of *Ta T'ung*.

This, too, will be the solution of all international difficulties.'—T. M. Van, in an interview.

V. IDEAS OF THE SUPREME BEING FOUND IN CONFUCIANISM

The Term *T'IEN*, or Heaven

'The most generally used word for the God-idea is *T'ien*. It is ambiguous and stands for a Personal Being at one time, and an Impersonal Object at another, and no attempt has been made to define its nature. . . . Since Chu Hsi and the Sung dynasty, *T'ien* has lost its personal quality and is identified with natural law, or just nature. . . . Such expressions as the "Virtue of Heaven," the "Reason of Heaven" and the "Word of Heaven" are commonly used in the literature of the present day, but they are only figurative and poetic names for nature and natural law.'—Y. Y. Tsu, in *The Chinese Recorder*, May 1919.

The Term *SHANG TÌ*, or Ruler Above

'It may not be altogether proper to consider *Shang Ti* (Lord on High) as a being residing in Heaven (*T'ien*). Though it is certain that he was not merely a moral power nor the personification of Heaven, as some Christian missionary scholars of Chinese religion are inclined to believe, he was not a person in the fullest sense of the word. But he had something of personality in him and could properly be called "he" instead of "it." . . . When the Chinese spoke of *Shang Ti*, they had in their minds something of an august

supreme being in Heaven above, who was the arbiter of human destiny, though not their creator. He did not, exactly speaking, reside in Heaven, but Heaven was his material or objective expression.'—D. T. Suzuki, in his *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy.*

The Supreme Being held Inaccessible except to the Few

'The Chinese never caught a glimpse of their God. He was hidden far up in the azure skies, he could not be brought into immediate personal touch with mortals. His presence could only be inferred through the manifestations of his power—that is, through extraordinary natural phenomena.'—D. T. Suzuki, in his *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy.*

'That the ancients had some knowledge of God history abundantly attests. His worship, however, was one of the prerogatives of the reigning house or family; and as "Son of Heaven" the king alone could offer sacrifices to the Highest Divinity on behalf of his nation. Lesser ranks worshipped lesser divinities.'—Li Ung-bing, in *Outlines of Chinese History.*

Meaning of the Two Terms to the Ancients

'We find in the History and the Odes that to God, whether considered as the personal *Shang Ti*, or the impersonal *T'ien*, the following qualities are attributed: He hears and sees; He enjoys offerings;

He has a heart or mind ; He is aided by men and deputes His work, especially to kings and their ministers ; He can be honoured and served ; He is awe-inspiring, of dread majesty and to be feared ; He confers on men their moral sense and makes retention of His favour dependent on moral character ; His will is glorious, may be known and must be complied with ; a virtuous king is after His own heart, but He will have no regard to the ill-doer ; with such a one He is angry ; the virtuous king He will reward with ease and dignity ; the appointment is contingent and He cannot be relied upon not to reverse it, for His favour may be lost ; He protects, but may withdraw His protection ; He warns, corrects and punishes the evil king, even afflicts, ruins and destroys him, and of this instances are clearly given. Such are the principal qualities attributed equally to *Shang Ti* and *T'ien.* In addition, other qualities are ascribed both by the History and the Odes to *T'ien. T'ien* gives birth to the people ; It gives valour and wisdom to princes ; It gives blessings to the good and woes to the evil ; It ordains the social order, the religious and social ceremonies and human virtues ; It sends down rain ; It is gracious to men and helps them ; Its will is unerring ; It does not shorten men's lives, they do that themselves ; It is not bound to individuals by ties of biased human affections ; It commands men to rectify their character ; It gives man his nature, compassionates him and grants his desires ; It is only moved by virtue, but men may cry and pray to It, for It will hear. In addition to many of the above, the Odes ascribe to *Shang Ti* that He is great ; that He appoints grain for nourishment ; that He gives comfort, but also hates ; that He smells a sweet savour ; that He spoke to King Wen ; that He

is an example or pattern ; and, in a doubtful passage, that He left a toe-print on the earth. In reference to *T'ien* the Odes also speak of a visitant from Heaven ; call *T'ien* pitying and just ; say that It can be offended ; call It our parent ; invoke It ; say that King Wen is in Heaven ; describe It as enlightening the people ; as intelligent and clear-seeing ; as giving blessings and prosperity ; and speak of God (*Ti*) as being in the great Heaven.'—W. E. Soothill, in *The Three Religions of China.*

'There was at least one thinker in ancient China who came to realize in a systematic way the existence more or less of a Supreme Being. I mean Motzŭ, the great exponent of humanism and utilitarianism. It was due to him that China ever came to reason methodically about the presence of a sovereign power in the world, superintending the course of nature, as well as the doings of moral creatures on earth. Whatever feelings the earlier moralists, philosophers and political writers might have entertained as to the manifestation of a divine will in human affairs, they were vague and merely tentative ; they lacked the support of sound reasoning. Motzŭ, however, for the first time conceived an all-powerful God intellectually, and devoted some special chapters in his book to the subject, trying to prove the presence of a Supreme Being and giving some concrete reasons why worship and reverence are due to Him. In fact, his doctrine of universal love and his extreme utilitarianism are based on the conception of a great, wise, just, impartial Will.'—D. T. Suzuki, in his *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy.*

Meaning of the Two Terms to the Educated Classes of To-day

'In order to ascertain the religious ideas of the present-day Confucianists, we recently put the question, "What does *T'ien* or *Shang Ti* mean, according to the Confucian standard?" to a number of Chinese scholars. The following replies are given because we believe they are typical of the present attitude of the educated people of the country outside of the Christian Church. One scholar, a man of both Chinese and western learning and editor of an important educational magazine, says: "*T'ien* or *Shang Ti* in Chinese means exactly the same as God in English. But the God-idea is now discredited by the educated people. We do not believe in a personal God any more." This man has spoken for a very large number of people. In matters of religion they have done no independent and deep thinking for themselves. Their Confucian education has predisposed them to agnosticism and unbelief. They accept certain views of well-known men, like Huxley and Spencer, as their own, and consider the questions therein involved thus closed and settled. They have thrown overboard the idea of a personal God, as being incompatible with the teachings of modern science. These people consider all religion as superstition, and so cannot see any good in the Christian religion. . . . Another scholar, an educationist widely known in Chinese and missionary educational circles, made this reply: "Let us exclude for the present the beliefs of the ignorant classes and consider the religious attitude of the educated classes only. To us, the term *T'ien* or *Shang Ti* is a collective one and stands for all that is mysterious and unexplained. The ancients were

surrounded by mysteries and they had no means of understanding them and so invented the belief in the existence of a mysterious being which they called *T'ien* or *Shang Ti.* The idea has persisted to this day because it has been found a useful means of social control. The ignorant classes have no self-control. The ' personal God ' idea excites fear and so acts as a restraint upon their conduct. As to the references in the Classics about the justice of Heaven, of rewards and punishments, that is only a way of writing and speaking. There is in nature the law of cause and effect, which works positively, and so there is no necessity for postulating a Personal Being in the universe dispensing rewards and punishments." That religion is useful as a police force in dealing with the ignorant classes that are weak in self-control is an idea that one meets with all the time. The idea is generally entertained by the educated classes with a good deal of self-complacency, for the other side of the statement is that the educated person who knows his duties and rights has no need for religion. To him religion is something that will be outlived. When science gets at the mysteries that still remain and throws on them the light of knowledge, then religion will disappear. A third scholar, who is a professor of Chinese History and Philosophy in a university in the country, made this reply: " I have thought a great deal on the subject. It seems to me, Christians and Confucianists do not differ very much on the belief in the existence of *Shen Ling* (spiritual and divine beings), but in one thing we differ fundamentally. Christians say: ' We know that God is personal ' ; whereas we Confucianists say: ' We do not know, for we have no way of finding out what God is like.' " This agnosticism is characteristic. God

exists, but He remains the Unknowable. This is the Creed of Confucianism. The first part makes you glow with pleasant anticipation of the wonderful vistas of spiritual insight that may be opened to you, but the second part slams the door right to and you are face to face with a solid stone wall. This stone wall of agnosticism is more difficult to surmount than open hostility, because the agnostic is always self-satisfied. Doubt is the prerequisite of enquiry and knowledge, but the agnostic excludes doubt, for he is positive of his own ignorance. He says: Human intellect is finite; it is vain for it to strive to know the Unknowable. "Honour the Gods, but let them alone." '—Y. Y. Tsu, in *The Chinese Recorder*, May 1919.

Christian Criticisms of the God-Idea in Confucianism

'No one in Chinese history has ever had a clear conception of God. The Chinese were more concerned with *Tao* than with God. . . . Confucius did not know what kind of God he believed in. He stopped before he reached the highest good. He educated his pupils to the highest moral pitch and held them there, without attaching them to the highest Person. This is the greatest shortcoming of Confucius, and perhaps he knew it himself. . . . There has been no Jesus in China to reveal God unmistakably and distinctly. . . . If only Confucius had known God a little better, the history of China would have been totally different and perhaps much more encouraging.' —Z. K. Zia, in *The Confucian Civilization.*

'Christianity can make a strong appeal to the Chinese mind by liberating it at once from the dogmas of Chinese philosophy and giving it an adequate con-

ception of the world of persons and things. For it is only in the Person of God that the centre of a cosmic and a personal world is found. . . . Though Christianity is primarily a life, not a philosophy, it nevertheless constitutes a tremendously powerful philosophical appeal. Its theism is the noonday sun in whose brilliancy the star of Chinese cosmic animism, though of considerable magnitude, must lose its significance and manifest its smallness.'—T. C. Chao, in *The Chinese Recorder*, June 1918.

VI. ANCESTOR WORSHIP

'To a foreigner, the Chinese worship of ancestors often seems clearly to be idolatry. . . . Belonging to a religion which holds that worship is from the heart and not by outward observances, the foreigner ought not to be guided by outward appearances, or even by the statements of ignorant people. . . . The foreigner should be ready to approach the Chinese worship of ancestors with an open mind and realize that it is the inner attitude, the inner interpretation of these rites, which makes them idolatrous or the reverse, and that since interpretations can vary they may be idolatrous to some, but at the same time not at all idolatrous to others. . . . Ancestor worship ceased to be idolatrous, or even a religious practice. . . . Burial ceremonies and the rites of worship became purely non-religious performances for those who adopted Hsüntzŭ's interpretation. The same was true of the worship of Heaven (which became one form of ancestor worship) and of the worship of Confucius. Consequently we are not surprised that the Emperor

K'ang-hsi should have informed the Jesuits that ancestor worship was not a religious rite; for him, as for other intelligent Confucians, that was literally true.'—Homer H. Dubs, in *The Chinese Recorder*, August 1927.

'Chinese worship ancestors not so much because they desire to obtain some benefit from their ancestors, as to express in some concrete way their gratitude to their ancestors for all they have. The important thing is the affection which the offspring in China is encouraged to cherish toward their dead forbears; no one pays much attention to what the dead are doing for their children or themselves.'—Bingham Dai, in a letter dated 29th August 1927

'To ancestor worship cling the most reverent thoughts, the deepest experiences of the Chinese religious mind. It has the sanction of antiquity. It represents a rooted belief in immortality, though more of the clan than of the individual. It calls to mind the links which bind a man alike with his past and his future, and enshrines that sense of ancestry, heritage and destiny which go to make greatness in nation and individual. It is the stage of the Chinese soul; the setting in which hero and sage alike visualize their life. In it is embedded that immortality of fame, "that last infirmity of noble minds," which great souls desire and prize above riches. A man sees himself one with an ancestry in whose glory he rejoices; and they for his life become the "great cloud of witnesses," spurring him on to high endeavour; and after him comes the line of those descendants who will be inspired and glorified in him, and in whom his death-

less memory is to be perpetuated.'—T. W. Douglas James, in *The Chinese Recorder*, November 1925.

'The real objection to ancestor worship is . . . that the spirits of the dead have, for the worshipper, the value of God; that just as in idolatry—one cannot blink the parallel—so also there is in ancestor worship that which perturbs the unique religious relation between the soul and God.'—P. J. Maclagan, in *Chinese Religious Ideas.*

'From time immemorial the Chinese race has cherished and observed the remembrances of their departed parents. Ancestor commemoration has always held a strong place in the family life of the people and continues to do so even up to the present day. Chinese life is built upon the unity of the family, and filial piety has been the backbone of the Chinese ethical code. But, alas, this simple and perfectly commendable tradition was in time corrupted by the introduction of a good deal of superstition and idol worship. People departed from the original custom and added to it much that is not desirable and helpful. It became a mixture both of ethical reverence for one's ancestors and of superstitious practices. When the Christian religion made its entrance to China, this custom of the commemoration of ancestors had drifted far away from its original and pure form, and had in it much that could not be reconciled with the teaching of Christ, who enjoined the worship of the one and only God our Father. . . . For years this was the greatest obstacle in hindering men and women from becoming followers of the way of our Lord.'—C. Y. Cheng, in *The International Review of Missions*, July 1923.

VII. CONFUCIANISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Difficulties which Confucianists meet in their Approach to Christianity

'The chief obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity in the mind of the Confucianist is the mystical element in Christianity.'—T. M. Van, in an interview.

'The chief obstacles are formalism in worship and church ceremonies; the objective conception of God; and the feeling that there is an absence of respect for parents in the teachings and actions of Jesus.'—Y. K. Woo, in an interview.

'There are four outstanding obstacles: the overemphasis in Christianity of the divine rather than the human aspects of life; certain traditions and religious dogmas, which to ordinary Confucianists seem to be engineered and not natural developments (e.g. the theory of sin, the resurrection, the Trinity and the Virgin Birth); the theory of the finality of the Person of Jesus Christ; and the evangelistic approach of Christian workers (the Chinese temperament is not very open to persuasion and preaching).'—T. L. Shen, in an interview.

'Probably the most serious difficulty is that the idea of the Christian God as a vivid person—even under the symbol of Father—can hardly be imagined or understood by Confucianists, whose view of the universe is naturalistic and impersonal.'—N. Z. Zia, in a letter dated 4th September 1927.

'Christians speak too much in terms of theology to be readily understood by the more rationalistic

Chinese mind. To the Chinese scholar Jesus appears too much in the light of a localized Jewish prophet, speaking in peasant terms, rather than as one who realizes the complicated problems of a large state; they need special preparation to enable them to appreciate Jesus. One of the chief difficulties is that Christianity has not yet produced a nation that acts in a Christian spirit. We cannot but go also into another question. Modern youth of the Far East have begun to find it more and more difficult to appreciate religions of any kind, because they think that in all such there are still tendencies either to maintain the *status quo* or to advocate palliatives which merely weaken desires for reform through any radical reorganization of society. Such critics attack Christ and Confucius particularly for lack of the revolutionary spirit.'—J. J. Poan, in an interview.

Contributions which some Chinese Christians believe Christianity should make to Confucianism

'The most vital appeal Christianity can make to China, indeed to the whole world, is found in its religion. . . . The Chinese people are ethically inclined, but religiously rather indifferent. The divorce of ethics from religion, and *vice versa*, as human history shows, have frequently, if not invariably, led to ethical formalism instead of a vital moral life, or religious legalism instead of a God-consciousness. For this reason, if Christianity is to make an ethical appeal, it must in the same breath present itself as the highest type of religious life. . . . So practical is Christianity that wherever it goes it lifts up the fallen, rescues the dying, builds new

homes, sanctifies human relationships, strengthens the nations and attempts to establish a universal society of love, so that there may be " peace on earth and goodwill towards man." . . . The Christ-life when lived will elevate the individual, brighten the home, regenerate society and make possible international living. If this is not practical, what else is ? Now the Chinese are intensely interested in what is practical and utilitarian, and if it can be shown that Christianity is as practical as life in all its complicated relations, and is able to meet all human needs and satisfy all human desires, it will without any doubt gain a strong hold in the Chinese heart and mind. . . . What China is in urgent need of now is a new social life and a clear social conscience. And if Christianity can meet this demand with a power for complete social regeneration, it will get the Chinese interested in it and will thoroughly convert them. . . . Can Christianity change the selfish purposes of China's leaders into patriotism and heroic self-sacrifice ? Can Christianity bring about a new social integration ? Again, there are the Chinese home, the Chinese woman and the Chinese child ; there are the sick and the poor ; can Christianity furnish them with a power, as well as a gospel, that will give life to all ? Christianity is hereby tested and the test is severe indeed, but if Christianity is really what it claims to be and if it is conscious of this power, it can and ought to make this social appeal to the Chinese people with confidence.'—T. C. Chao, in *The Chinese Recorder*, June 1918.

'The contributions which Christianity should make to Confucianism are : first, a first-hand,

personal experience of God; second, the principle of love which pervades all things and is of divine origin; third, the linking of the conception of the experience of God with the principle of love, through one personality—Jesus Christ; this linking is clearly shown in His life and teaching.'—T. L. Shen, in an interview.

'There are four distinct contributions which Christianity can and should make to Confucianism: viz. a more complete idea of God; an assurance of a future life; the teaching of the worth of the individual; and a high regard for woman.'—Daniel C. Fu, in an interview.

'Christianity can give content to Confucianism in that it can supply dynamic force to its cold principles and can make everything in its philosophy more vital. Christianity can introduce life and activity for social betterment. It can also give to the Confucianist its conception of God.'—Y. K. Woo, in an interview.

'Confucianism contains all the essential ideas of Christianity except its idea of God.'—T. M. Van, in an interview.

Contributions which Confucianism can make to the Development of Christianity in China

'Through the interpretation which Confucianism makes of the relations between man and man a Christian can learn better his duty to his fellows. Christians are apt to indulge themselves in abstract thinking and in mystical communion with the Unseen. Through the help of Confucianism they are once more

brought to earth to face the common tasks of every-day life.'—Y. K. Woo, in an interview.

'The ethical concepts of Confucianism are more detailed and systematic than those of Christianity. There is a greater emphasis upon what the relations between different groups of men should be. Christianity gives only general principles of action.'—T. M. Van, in an interview.

'The two real values in Confucianism which we should preserve, develop and share with humanity, are the two original thoughts of Confucius himself: viz. *Jen* (or ideal personality) and *Ta T'ung* (or cosmopolitanism or world consciousness).'—N. Z. Zia, in a letter dated September 4, 1927.

'Contributions which Confucianism can and should make to the ultimate Christianity of China are its reverence for ancestors and its doctrine of the five human relations.'—Daniel C. Fu, in an interview.

'Confucianism can and should help Chinese Christians through its emphasis on the practical ethical basis of human life, its idea of the possibility of moral achievement in every man and its ideal of harmony with the universe.'—T. L. Shen, in an interview.

'Confucianism has a distinct place and function in religious education for the Chinese. Its religious philosophy has been the religious philosophy of intellectuals for all ages. Its teachings have defined the attitudes and values of the people, educated as well as uneducated. Its ethics has moulded all the social customs and institutions of the people. . . . Although Confucianism cannot solve the problems of modern China, it can at least give to the religious

educator a social background, and also a key to re-directing the attitudes already possessed by the people and the activities already going on.'—C. S. Miao, in an unpublished manuscript.

What Attitude should Christians take?

'What can we do but unfold to them, with prayers and pains, what truth there is in Confucianism about God and His moral government, and about themselves, leading them on to the deeper, richer truth about the same subjects in Christianity.'—James Legge, quoted by John C. De Korne, in *Chinese Altars to the Unknown God.*

'We must help the Chinese to understand that we cannot have the core of Christianity in the mere ethical teachings of Jesus, apart from His wonderful personality of love.'—J. J. Poan, in an interview.

'Here we reach the heart of the matter. The Christian scholar can supply to ethical teaching that religious sanction which present-day Confucianism lacks. In this respect, too, he may do well, I think, in spite of what some students assert, to build on what he finds and to reaffirm the ancient spiritual conceptions while at the same time purifying them. The deity of *Shang Ti* must be so set forth as to leave no function for the subordinate spirits of the ancient theology. In doing this, however, care must be taken not to de-personalize Him so that He becomes as in later Confucian teaching the impersonal rational principle of the universe. It is by the aid of the Christian faith that this can be done, for it is in Christ that the Godhead is revealed in all its richness,

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the *Living* God."'
—P. J. Maclagan, in *The International Review of Missions*, April 1914.

'We have been hearing, not perhaps without a measure of patience, that we must interpret Christianity in terms of Chinese culture. There is a good deal in it. But what we really need is a thorough understanding of the teachings of Jesus and a direct experience of Christ, through a living of His kind of life. The Christian message is clearly far above what Confucius can offer and what his followers can give. Mankind wants God. My personal opinion is that God can be found in clear expression only in the Lord incarnate, our Lord Jesus Christ. The greatest task ahead, it seems to me, is a creating of the direct experience of God through our faith in Christ. The Christian message lies clearly in the definite faith in God as Father, with whom His believing children can have personal communion through the living of a life as exemplified in Jesus, a life of moving and conquering love. It is clear that Confucius has not given us a gospel, a simple yet magnificent gospel, of the love of God the father, who wants us all to be like Christ, and to have the most abundant life, that contains in it a wonderful peace and joy and a contact with everlasting reality.'—T. C. Chao, in a letter dated September 4, 1927.

CHRISTIANITY AND BUDDHISM[1]

KENNETH J. SAUNDERS, LITT.D.

I. DIVERSE VIEWS OF BUDDHISM

AS I set to work to draft this report, two letters from experienced missionary leaders of great sympathy and insight reached me. The first is from an old friend who has made a careful study of Buddhism during sixteen years of pioneer work in Ceylon : he writes, ' Buddhism here has no spiritual values—if that phrase refers to any relation to higher powers.' The second letter is from one who has spent a much longer period in China : he writes of Buddhists, monks and others, who ' may give to the Christian Church something of the wonderful treasures which Christ, as the Eternal Logos, has bestowed upon them through Buddhism.' And he goes on to speak of some 5000 Buddhist monks with whom, in the past few years, he has lived in spiritual fellowship.

These two attitudes are the two extremes among many expressed by missionaries. Both writers speak

[1] Two papers in this series deal with Buddhism : Dr Reischauer deals with Northern Buddhism, particularly as manifested in Japan ; Dr Saunders gives the greater part of his space to Southern Buddhism, but writes also out of his experience of Buddhism in other fields. It will be observed that on certain points the two writers are not agreed, especially, perhaps, as to the meaning of Nirvana, and also on certain aspects of the Buddha's own teaching. In a realm where the best authorities differ, it has seemed well to leave these divergent views to be studied side by side.

from experience and in love : both are close students and men of great ability, and their opinions deserve the most careful attention. I take it that it is such questions, above everything else, that the Jerusalem Meeting desires to discuss. Therefore, I throw out only one or two suggestions. Are both correct ? Is Ceylon Buddhism as unspiritual as this ? Is it the environment of China which has made this great difference ? Are the Chinese, then, more religious than the Sinhalese ? The question sounds like a paradox, in view of all accepted positions on this subject, and it is worth noting that it was a Sinhalese Buddhist, Dharmapala, who in 1893 did so much to awaken the monks of China. Part of the answer lies, of course, in the difference between the *Mahayana* and the *Hinayana* [1] forms of Buddhism ; yet the former had its chance also in Ceylon ; and it was something more like the latter which first entered China.

I suspect that the two writers have a different view of what is ' spiritual.' But even if we confine it, as the first writer does, to that which has a reference to outside powers, it must be noted that Buddhists in Ceylon use a phrase which occurs in one letter to me, ' By the grace of the Triple Gem ' and ' By the mercy of God ' ; and any one noting the amusing and amazing adoption of Christian hymns by Southern Buddhists will see that there must be something in them which finds the expression of Christian piety congenial and necessary. And if it be argued, as my first correspondent does argue, that they are not Buddhist in so far as they show such manifestations of piety, my reply would be that they call themselves

[1] ' Greater Vehicle ' and ' Lesser Vehicle,' i.e. Sanskrit and Pali Buddhism.

Buddhists, and that Buddhism, in spite of many text-books, has always had a vast outer circle of lay people less rationalist and more pious than the monks. The Founder intended that it should be so, and there is much evidence to support the Pali text which says, 'Whosoever would attain to a heavenly rebirth, let him attach himself with love and faith to me.' [1] As the monuments prove, there has always been a lay-Buddhism which can only be described as a *bhakti*—a cult of devotion and faith.

Let us hear the detached scholar. Here we are fortunate in having a charming and scholarly article from one who knows Ceylon Buddhism better than any one else in Europe.[2]

Dr William Geiger, who has studied Ceylon and loved its people during a long lifetime, lately visited it once more. He has given us a vivid account of his impressions of Buddhism,[3] which Buddhists and Christians will alike welcome as sympathetic and impartial. Here is a picture of a scene so familiar to the missionary that it may almost pass unnoticed: 'Before the Bodhi tree opposite the Dalada temple in Kandy we came upon a man with his little daughter. He was kneeling with the child before the tree, and folding her hands and rehearsing a prayer to her, she repeating it word for word after him. Our coming did not disturb their devotions. That side by side with this there are thousands who are tepid and indifferent goes without saying. The same, for that matter, may be said of so-called higher civilizations

[1] *Alagaddupama Sutta*, '*Yesam mayi saddha mattam pema mattam sabbe te saggaparayana.*'

[2] It is perhaps significant that the humblest and profoundest things I have to quote from western scholars are from Germans.

[3] 'Memories of Ceylon,' *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1924–7.

—more properly to be called younger civilizations—and of these perhaps in a higher proportion.'

In another passage Dr Geiger describes very happily a *paritta*, or *pirit* ceremony, held at Mulkirigala, a remote shrine, in honour of his wife and himself, and for the happiness and success of their journey. 'I do not hesitate to confess,' he says, 'that the little ceremony made a deep impression on us both. The demeanour of the priests was so serious and dignified, the quiet devotion of my friend (a Buddhist layman) was so sincere, that we told ourselves: Here is yet true and genuine piety; the Buddha teaching has here yet spiritual force.'

Here then the trained and sympathetic eye sees that in quiet and unobtrusive ways Buddhism, whether in the innumerable acts of private devotion at wayside shrines, or in the ceremonies provided for special occasions, is still alive and meets the spiritual needs of the people in ways which the missionary will note. He may well seek to provide better opportunities for quiet prayer, e.g., in churches always open, or at wayside crucifixes; and, as the wise monk does, will hold a service for the blessing of the traveller, or of great family occasions such as the building of a new home or the eating of the first solid food by the baby—occasions which Buddhism, in spite of its monastic tendency, has always been eager to serve.

Dr Geiger is out of sympathy with the attempts to graft Buddhism on to western conditions, to which he considers it is alien, and also with those Europeans who resort to Ceylon, Burma, or Siam, to lead there the life of a *bhikkhu*. Yet that there are sincere men amongst these European Buddhists no one who knows them can doubt. They are them-

selves a proof that Buddhism is not merely a matter of ceremonies, nor of a conservative patriotism easily understood in the light of the present nationalist movements. It lives on because of these things, but also because it satisfies many thoughtful minds as the best expression available of religious truth. One of these European converts who was trained for the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church, and is a *Zen* Buddhist quite akin to the Ceylon monk, writes to me as follows :

' You ask me to tell you what is *the* motive-power in Buddhism as I know it.

' Of course, as your question indicates, you realize that the motive-power must be something individual, something unique. The motive-power in Buddhism cannot be an emotional wave which would include all people and so give a fundamental explanation. One may obtain a generalization in a way, and I think the generalization would read : Emancipation —i.e. freedom from " I "—and the gaining of insight and the assurance of " salvation."

' Personally, I have a great difficulty in giving you something definite and concise outside of the above statement. The motive-power is complex. Then, you must remember, I have had a long lone struggle to understand Buddhism. The results I have arrived at are from personal contemplation, and not from university lectures, etc. I have had no help, but lots of criticism and abuse.

' To me, Buddhism is *true*, i.e. it accords with experience, reason and logic, in so far as the *Dharma* (i.e. law of conduct) is concerned ; this is also the criterion of scientific truth. Knowing this through experience, it has proved the motive-power in my mission work and gave me strength to stand up

bravely against all odds. I knew I was telling the people what was true. Hence I may say that, to me, is the motive-power in Buddhism. I cannot conceive of a better motive-power at present.

'But that is from the intellectual side only—but the first step. The *deeper* motive-power lies beyond science, reason and logic. I learned in Buddhism that all phenomena—personality, etc.—belonged to the non-I, and knowing that, I turned my power of cognition inwardly to discover the reality in which lies the All of life. Then getting an insight into it and the motive-power it developed became the motive-power which has captured my whole life and impels me to go out into the byways and tell people to look within through the veil of personality, and there discover their happiness and salvation. The touch, so to speak, of the Infinite, the Buddha, God —to give It names—is sufficient cause to exert one's self and spend one's life in helping others to freedom and salvation.'

To sum up, we may say that this writer has experienced in Buddhism emancipation from self, and a supra-rational joy—'beyond reason and logic'—which is of the essence of mysticism.

It is unfair to doubt the sincerity of such a statement from a man who has borne loneliness and misunderstanding for what he believes to be the truth; and scholars are beginning to realize that while it is easy to emphasize the negative and the barren in this rather monastic Buddhism of the South, yet there is something more positive and living. This may be described as the mystical element, and the rational explanation of it. In other words, Buddhism is at once an experience and a philosophy. Dr Otto in

his epoch-making work *Das Heilige* has called attention to this element of experience :

It is the 'Beyond' of the mystic — the 'numinous'—the kernel of religion—which he calls 'Nothingness'—not only because nothing can be predicated of it, but because it is absolutely and intrinsically other than and opposite of everything that is and can be thought. . . . 'But what is true of the strange "nothingness" of our mystics holds good equally of the "sunyam" and the "sunyata," the "void" and "emptiness" of the Buddhist mystics.' [1]

'It is only conceptually that "Nirvana" is a negation ; it is felt in consciousness as in the strongest degree positive ; it exercises a fascination by which its votaries are as much carried away as are the Hindu and the Christian by the corresponding objects of their worship. I recall vividly a conversation I had with a Buddhist monk. He had been putting before me methodically and pertinaciously the argument for the Buddhist "theology of negation," the doctrine of *anatman* and "entire emptiness." When he had made an end, I asked him what the Nirvana itself is : and after a long pause came at last the single answer, low and restrained : "Bliss—unspeakable." And the hushed restraint of the answer, the solemnity of his voice, demeanour and gesture made more clear what was meant than the words themselves.' [2]

These words of Dr Otto compel careful attention. He is perhaps the leading theologian of our time.

[1] *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 30. Elsewhere Dr Otto says : 'Mysticism is . . . a coming into predominance of the Irrational, which may take place in different ways, and with widely different content. . . . The content of the experience is utterly ineffable. It cannot be transmitted . . .' See vol. iii. No. 2 of *The Eastern Buddhist*.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 39.

The mystical element in Buddhism has been much neglected in the West, and I remember, as long ago as 1912, Dr Oldenberg correcting me when I said that I missed this element : 'No, no, Buddhism is essentially mystical.' He had studied it in relation to the Upanishads ; and it has become more and more clear to me since that it must be understood as an answer to the ancient prayer of India,

> **From the unreal lead me to the real,**
> **From darkness to light,**
> **From death to the undying.**

Nirvana is, in fact, a mystical experience, an experience rare as all mystical experience is, but nevertheless authentic, an experience of a Beyond which is also within. The Pali texts describe it as reality, beside which all else is mirage, as an island in the sea of *samsara* (wandering), as being in the midst of becoming, as the permanent in the midst of the transient, as bliss in the midst of sorrow. No one who will study these synonyms for Nirvana, especially in such summaries as Section XV of the *Dhammapada*, will ever again repeat the parrot-cry of the West, that Buddhism is mere negation, or mere pessimism. And if we want to know what a spiritually-minded monk of Ceylon is like, here is the answer : He is one who is joyful in the midst of sorrow, calm in the midst of turmoil, gentle in the midst of hatred, poor, yet possessing all things because of his experience of Transcendent Truth. This is, of course, an ideal, but I think that it is realized at times and in some degree—though *Arhats*, those who have reached the goal, no longer exist.

So real is this mystical core of Buddhism that another eminent German theologian, Friedrich Heiler, has said, as quoted in the new *Pali-English Dictionary*,

'Nirvana is, although it might sound a paradox, in spite of all conceptional negativity nothing but "eternal salvation," after which the heart of the religious yearns on the whole earth.' We can at any rate agree with two American Baptist missionaries in Burma, that we may preach Nirvana through Christ.[1] For Nirvana means an ethical as well as a mystical experience. It is the end of *tanha* (desire) as well as the unspeakable joy of transcendental experience. We might say, without going far wrong, that when the Fourth Gospel speaks of the 'Son of Man which is in heaven' it describes an experience of other-worldly peace in the midst of time which is akin to that of the Buddhist *Arhat*. The 'Psalms of the Early Buddhists' are full of this joy in mystical truth. While it is true that mysticism may be communion with a personal Lord, there is another type which is pantheistic—perhaps the more usual type. 'Mysticism is reason applied to a sphere above rationalism,' says Dean Inge: 'its essence is this sense of ultimate Truth reached not by logic but by a "higher" process: Truth which is transcendent and ineffable.'

Was the Buddhism of these early devotees wholly devoid of the former and more personalist type? Is it not likely that as the Galilean so stirred men's hearts by His sincerity and loving friendliness that they re-read the nature of God Himself in new terms, so the Sākyan by these same great qualities inevitably put a content into the Indian conception of the Unseen which led to a new religious experience? We can watch the process at work in the Pali texts as in the Gospels.

[1] *The End of the Law*, ch. xi. Gilmore and Smith, Association Press, Calcutta; a small but important work.

Whatever our Christologies or our Buddhologies may be, the great fact remains that behind all religions there is Religion and the religious consciousness of man. The mystics are the experts who experience the truth by which the rest of us live. According to their upbringing and environment, they give the ineffable a local habitation and a name. But the missionary must get behind names to realities ; and there is a growing recognition among such Buddhist scholars as D. T. Suzuki and such Christian scholars as Rudolf Otto that what the German mystic calls *Das Nichts* and the Upanishad seer, *Neti*, the Buddhist calls *Sunyata* : it is 'that from which words turn back.' [1]

The first step, then, towards an understanding of Buddhism and of Buddhists must be a quest of the historic founder,and a study of his religious experience.

II. THE QUEST OF THE HISTORIC SAKYAMUNI

After nearly a century of western scholarship, the quest of the historic Sakyamuni still goes on, and controversy is still vigorous. Of no historic figure are so many divergent views held and defended. Nor is eastern thought less at variance. Buddhists themselves hold many different views about their master. 'The diamond-throne of the original enlightenment,' says Okakura Kakuzo, 'is now hard indeed to discover, surrounded as it is by the labyrinths of gigantic pillars and elaborate porticoes

[1] See articles in *The Eastern Buddhist*, edited by D. T. Suzuki, esp. vol. iii. No. 2. The study of psychology is a pre-requisite to the study of religion : things psychologically akin are often theologically separate, as Dr Suzuki points out.

which successive architects have erected, as each added his portion to the edifice of faith.' [1] That is true as well as beautiful. And it is not only because of the elaboration of Buddhism by later sects that it is hard to find the founder; it is because those who claim to be nearest to him are themselves widely divided in their attitude towards him. Not only is there the wide gulf between the *Mahayana* and *Hinayana*; in the Pali Canon itself there are several stages of Buddhology which await critical evaluation, and until we have some clear evidence as to what was central in the founder's person and mission the whole question remains in confusion. *Was* the house of Buddhism a 'House of Faith'? To many a modern Buddhist it was a house of scientific thought; and the Buddha is revealed sitting upon a diamond-throne of dialectic. 'Surely a notable milestone in the history of human ideas,' says Mrs Rhys Davids (in commenting upon the Buddhist formula of causation: 'that being present this becomes; that being absent this does not become'), 'that a man reckoned for ages by thousands as the Light, not of Asia only but of the world, and the Saviour from sin and misery should call this little formula his Norm or Gospel, at least one aspect of that gospel.' [2] This view, which clearly is only one phase of Mrs Rhys David's interpretation, and which she would now put differently, has been lately attacked by Dr Berriedale Keith, who maintains that, 'given the psychological conditions of the time, it would have been a miracle had the Buddha been capable of the rationalism imputed to him. . . . It was the age of the growth of the great gods Śiva and Viśnu, in their various forms, and the Buddha's success was due to the

[1] *The Ideals of the East*, p. 60.

[2] *Buddhism*, p. 39.

fact that he either had claims to divinity or his followers attributed it to him, and won general acceptance for the view. It is conceivable that divinity was thrust upon him against his will, but every ground of probability supports the plain evidence of the texts that he himself had claims which necessarily conferred upon him a place as high as the rank of the greatest of gods.' [1] These two positions may be said to express the extremes of western scholarship in its attempt to discover the historic Sakyamuni. For one he is Rationalist, for the other Deity. The one emphasizes faith as essential to his disciples, the other reason.

The confusion of thought in which western scholarship finds itself may be partially explained by the statement of Hermann Oldenberg, who said, nearly fifty years ago, 'The Indian mind was wanting in that simplicity which can believe without knowing, as well as in that bold clearness which seeks to know without believing, and therefore the Indian had to frame a doctrine, a religion and a philosophy combined, and therefore, perhaps, if it must be said neither the one nor the other, Buddhism.' [2]

Buddhism is, in fact, a Middle Path in this as in everything else. Not only is it a Middle Path between the way of the world and the way of the ascetic, it is also a Middle Path between the way of the rationalist and the way of the man of faith; and in placing the emphasis most truly we shall probably do well to follow the clue given us by Sénart—a view held by Sankara and familiar to Indian thought—that Sakyamuni was essentially an early mystic, who, because he himself realized the ineffable experience

[1] *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 29.
[2] *Buddha*, English Translation, p. 6.

of the conquest of *tanha*, spoke with authority to the conscience and heart of man ; and because he was also a thinker, seeking to explain this great experience, appeared as an ethical teacher, when he explained it as the cessation of *tanha*, and as a religious and a philosophical teacher when he went on to the further interpretation that it means also escape from *samsara*. Himself more interested in the experience of Nirvana than in the explanation, he was yet an Indian teacher seeking to lead others to *moksha* (release). If they were to share his great experience he had necessarily to use the categories of Indian thought and to set forth Nirvana as freedom from *samsara*.

Many western writers have trembled on the verge of this interpretation. Most of them have fallen back upon the conclusion that here was an early Socrates, or an early Hume, or some more ethical Upanishadic thinker. There is truth in these positions ; what makes them false is that inveterate tendency of the ' either, or.' With one recent Indian statement, that of Dr B. Barua, that the Buddha was essentially a philosopher, some may be found to agree, but Dr Barua himself goes on to quote that very vital passage in which the Teacher says : ' There are things profound, hard to realize, hard to understand, yet tranquillizing, sweet, not to be grasped by logical reason, subtle, intelligible only by the wise.' [1] It is for these things that the Buddha must be rightly praised. Here then is a key passage : it is not for his morality or moral teaching, not for

[1] Prolegomena to *A History of Buddhist Philosophy*, quoting *Dialogues of the Buddha*, ii. pp. 33–6. Cf. Professor Whitehead's statement that ' Buddhism was a metaphysic generating a religion ' (*Religion in the Making*, p. 50).

his use of logical reason, not for his philosophical achievements that the founder is to be praised, it is for that apprehension of mystical truth which is the Buddhist equivalent of the *Neti* of the Upanishads, an expression 'from which words turn back'—and which idealists of the *Mahayana*—recognizing it as the essence of Buddhism—call *Sunyata*—the void, the ineffable.

It is, in other words, as one who grasps things by intuition that Sakyamuni claims originality; and yet if we are to accept the passage in *Majjhima Nikaya*, II. 19, he calls himself a *Vibhajjavadin*, that is, an Analyst, rather than an *Ekamsavadin* or Synthetist. This also may be true. For the mystic may also have in him something of the rationalist, and if he is to communicate his experience he must seek at any rate to make it intelligible to others. It was an age of mystical seers like those of the Upanishads, and of a vigorous dialectic like that of the sixty-two schools mentioned in Buddhist texts. Some, at any rate, of these were philosophers and some were rationalists. The view that Sakyamuni was an early *yogi*[1] has been well stated by Sénart, who in 1889 said emphatically, 'Buddhism is not a philosophic sect; it is a system of *yoga*,'[2] and who in 1900 [3] worked out this view, and showed that we have in the four *Dhyanas* of Buddhism (a central doctrine and practice common to Northern and Southern Buddhism, and therefore very old) an even older Indian practice, which is of the essence of *yoga*. The famous Buddhist practice of *brahma-*

[1] *Yoga* may be defined as a technique of the mystical experience.
[2] *Revue des Deux Mondes.*
[3] See 'Bouddhisme et Yoga,' *Revue d'Histoire des Religions*, 1900, vol. ii. p. 345.

vihara carries in its very name the proof of its origin, and Patanjali, in his *Yoga-Sutras*, uses the very words of the Pali texts—a proof that he looked upon these practices of *mettā* (benevolence), *karuna* (compassion), *mudita* (sympathy), and *upekha* (balance or detachment), as common property not distinctively Buddhist, but belonging to *yoga* as such.

The four stages, again, by which the Buddha analyses the disease of the world and lays down the essential treatment known as the 'Four Noble Truths' of Buddhism, are the old stages of medical diagnosis, which we find coming up again in the *Yoga-Sutras* and, as the technique of meditation leading to ecstasy is the same, so are the powers (*iddhi*) to which they lead.

More may be said on this subject, but here it may suffice to note that in the great works of art of the Andhra and Gupta periods exemplified in the solitary Buddha in the jungles of Anuradhapura and in the even more deserted Deer Park at Sarnath, the artists have left to us the clear proof that here is in fact a *yogi*, seated with eyes closed, regulating his breath, with head and trunk in one line, and with hands folded in meditation. Here in fact is *samadhi* (contemplation), which is the crown and goal of the Eightfold Noble Path. This Path, though it begins with right views, is in fact a path for the mystic, and ends in right ecstasy.

And as these old masterpieces of Buddhist art may be looked upon as strong rocks amidst the shifting sands of the Texts and the surging waves of the Schools, so when we look at the modern practice of the Buddhist monk—whether in Ceylon,

with its strange meditation upon skeletons, or in some *Zen* temple in Japan, or in the *Chan* Schools of China and Korea—we find that the living heart of Buddhism, amidst much that is dead and corrupt, is this practice. It is this, and this alone, which keeps alive the old faith, which, because it is essentially *yoga*, is able to attach to itself almost any outward observances. *Yoga* is in fact, as Poussin has said, a technique 'in itself strange to all morals as to all religious and philosophic theory, but from this technique there can be separated out, and to it there can be added, morals, theology and devotion.'[1]

At the core, then, of early Buddhism was the Solitary, the great Seer, the Mystic—Sakyamuni, surrounded by a small group of others who had caught his spirit, and entered into some of these difficult practices. At the circumference were all sorts of lay people, to whom he could not communicate even an idea of such things. For them he had a different technique, and to them he offered a different goal. 'Whatsoever householder desires to be reborn in a heaven, let him attach himself to me with faith and devotion,' says the *Majjhima Nikaya*, 'but whatsoever monk would realize Nirvana, let him tread the noble Eightfold Path'; for the way of the mystic is a difficult and elusive way, open only to those who have the original spiritual genius to tread it, and who are prepared to give their whole time and attention to its pursuit. The layman *may* attain Nirvana; it is very unlikely that he will ever attempt it. That his interpretation of this profound experience of Nirvana is what it is, is due to the fact that Sakyamuni was an Indian

[1] *Nirvana*, p. 12.

of the sixth century before Christ, and could only explain it in terms of current thought; that he was a great original thinker is evidenced by the fact that he had the courage to interpret it ethically rather than metaphysically, and to urge upon men that what mattered was the moral emancipation rather than the monistic interpretation. And even to the laity like Sigalo, whom we find worshipping the gods of the four quarters, he insists that the true worship of the gods is righteous living: to honour mother and father, to treat one's household aright, this is to pay due respect to the gods. To the specialist to meditate upon the great virtues or graces of kindness, compassion and sympathy, this is the true mysticism; and it will lead on to that *upekha*, or *yoga*, which is balance, harmony or poise. The world is out of joint because men are following false views, and obsessed with false pursuits. This is the meaning of *dukhha* (literally, misery), and over against it Sakyamuni holds out the alluring vision of that *santi* (peace) which he has himself experienced. This, and this alone, is *sukham* (joy). From the ordinary *yogi* this great one differs in that his experience was profound and ethical—and that he established the practice on a rational basis. From the texts of the Upanishads he differed in bringing into daily life some of the glamour of the Ineffable.

That educated India is to-day turning back and finding in Sakyamuni her greatest teacher is significant. A leading Hindu said recently, 'The only two figures of supreme moral power are the Buddha and the Christ.'

Both are mystics in a supreme sense, in their genius for contemplation and in sacrificial service

of men. True summaries of their teachings are the famous words :

' One thing only do I teach—suffering and the end of suffering,' i.e. Nirvana. ' I am come to give life and life more abundant,' i.e. eternal life.

Which Teacher can better meet the needs of man and better reveal God ?

Two other statements as to the historic founder of Buddhism may here be quoted. The first is from Dr M. Anesaki, Professor of the Science of Religion in the University of Tokyo. He wrote, in 1912, ' He was a mystic visionary, but he lived nearly fifty years of his ministry in constant activities. . . . The two sides of training—self-culture and actions—found a perfect union in the person of the Buddha.' And he sees, rightly I think, in this richness of the personality of the founder the germs of the later schools, that which followed the *Arhat*, and that which followed the *Bodhisattva* ideal. Yet, as Dr Anesaki says, this division between the more mystical and the more actively ethical exists among the followers of the latter ideal, the *Mahayana*, also.

The following statement from Dr J. N. Farquhar, Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester, is illuminating, and may serve as a useful summary before we leave this very important question. He writes to me under date of 8th Jun 1927 : e,

' I think I agree in the main with your conception of the Buddha, but I would put it in some such way as this :

' We can decide most certainly as to what was fundamental for the Buddha by studying what the discipline and curriculum were which he imposed

on his monks and nuns. If I understand the discipline of the Buddhist monastery, it had two sides, *the first*, a continuous course of moral and intellectual self-discipline for every ascetic; *the second*, the practice of trances. Thus we may be perfectly certain that what was uppermost in his mind was his own long struggle with moral and intellectual problems, but that he had found his *yoga* life both refreshing and a source of truth, i.e. your mysticism.

'Alongside of these two fundamental facts, however, I would place what Dr Keith lays stress on, namely that *he was worshipped as a divine being* and *felt there was good reason for the observance.* That comes out clearly, I believe, in the earliest literature, and led finally to the whole theory of the Buddha and the many Buddhas and the temples of the *Mahayana.* This side of the situation was, I believe, quite inevitable in ancient India. The contrast between that ancient polytheistic atmosphere, and the rarefied air in which Jesus was accepted as the Son of the Living God, is most instructive historically as well as practically.'

Such, then, is the result of the long quest of the historic Buddha. No one to-day is justified in being dogmatic, least of all in repeating the facile generalizations so often heard: 'Buddhism is not a religion, but a philosophy; Buddhism is sheer pessimism; the Buddha was an ethical teacher and nothing else.' We shall do well to drop the text-books and go to the texts!

III. THE LIVING FORCES OF BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Another good starting-point is with the people immediately about us—'living epistles.' We may work backwards to the founder from them, as we have here attempted to work forwards from him. What are the living forces of Buddhism to-day? What, again, are the living forces of the Christian Gospel which will enable it to meet human needs in Buddhist lands? Some evidence on these difficult questions will be found for South Asia in my *Buddhism and Buddhists in Southern Asia*, and in two little monographs, *Modern Buddhism in Ceylon* and *Modern Buddhism in Burma*, the latter edited with the Rev. W. C. B. Purser, and both based upon evidence obtained from missionaries and others.

Evidence from China will be found in Dr Reichelt's book, *Truth and Tradition in Chinese Buddhism*, and in Dr Hodous's *Buddhism and Buddhists in China*; and, for Japan, there is Dr Armstrong's new volume, *Buddhism and Buddhists in Japan*. I think all the authors (and they write with a missionary purpose) would agree that Buddhism is, at any rate, an attempt to meet human needs and to comfort human hearts, that it is alive because it has not wholly failed, and that Christianity will succeed if it can be mediated to Buddhists in a form which they can understand. Towards the expression of an Asiatic Christianity the western missionary can do but little. His task is to help prepare the way for some Asiatic genius who shall do for the faith in Asia what the author of the Fourth Gospel

did for the Greek world. What, then, are the forces which keep Buddhism alive? We may mention its ethics and its view of the world. But first let us read a popular, yet scholarly statement contributed by Mrs Rhys Davids, which vividly describes a devout young Sinhalese layman, at once loyal to Buddhism and wistful with a sense that there might be something better. In the second place we have a statement from Dr Hodous as to the revival of Buddhism in China, together with one from Dr Reichelt on the inner life of Chinese Buddhism. The remaining document, which goes to the very roots of the matter, is that of the Christian leader and social reformer, Toyohiko Kagawa, in Japan.

The reader is invited to note in the first (*a*) the young layman's attitude to the Buddhist monks, who are called in chiefly in times of trouble. His attitude is one of respect tempered by a sense that, while the laity are dependent upon the monks, they feel that there are great limitations in them: that they need help in the problems of to-day and the monks cannot give it. (*b*) It will be well to note in this statement from Ceylon the longing for a more positive spiritual helper. 'We are in the dark,' says this young man; and there is abundant evidence to show that it is the lay people of Ceylon who are speaking here.

In the China papers is a vivid proof that the ancient order of the Buddhist brethren has in it capacity for revival, and bears out the position of the missionary in China with which we started. The third document shows how ready Japanese Buddhists are to co-operate with Christians and to imitate them. It also indicates that the thoughtful Japanese mind is impressed by current trends in philosophic thought,

and that where personalism wins, Christianity has a stronger appeal than the more pantheistic Buddhism : but most important of all is the strong statement of Kagawa San that the Japanese are weary of philosophical and theological discussion, and hungry to see the spirit of Christ incarnate in sacrificial service.

A Document from Ceylon [1]

(*From* Mrs Rhys Davids)

It was in the train coming from Oxford that I met him—a young Sinhalese, whose parents had sent him over to England to be taught something of what western culture means, in economics and law, on a very slender basis of education gained at an English school in Ceylon. He was feeling perplexed and very home-sick. . . .

'Yes,' he said, 'I am a Buddhist. I was brought up as one. My people are Buddhists, they have none of them joined the Christians, as many in our island have. My parents are pious people. They worship the three Refuges—Buddha, Teaching, *Sangha* ; and they keep the *śilas* : Not to take life knowingly, not to steal, not to be adulterous, not to lie, slander, abuse, or chatter, not to go where strong drink is drunk. That's what we profess, you know, when we say we are Buddhists. . . .

'We respect and support the monks ; we give them alms when they pass our houses on their alms-rounds ; we give in other ways ; we go to hear them recite from the scriptures on *uposatha* . . . and full-moon days. When the reciting is in Sinhalese, and we understand, we can get good from it ; we can

[1] This paper originally appeared in *The Daily Express*, London.

get good fun sometimes, when it is birth-stories that are being told.

'We have faith in our monks; we believe that they will instruct us not in what is wrong, but in what it is good for us to follow. They don't instruct us fully about life; their teaching about women and about children seems to leave out much; they have nothing to teach us about the bigger things we're up against now—the other races, the Empire, world duties—world duties where there are no monks. No, we should not look to them for teaching on these; we do feel a need of them when we are in trouble, or are ill or dying.

'What will they tell you then? you ask. If you wish it, they may come and recite a *paritta* (warding rune) for you. There are several of these; I believe, though I am not sure, that they are all from our scriptures. The one we have oftenest is about the wise and good life which brings a man the highest luck; others are professions of goodwill towards all creatures as a way of warding off harm from any form of them. They are very old, these *parittas*; I am told that, whereas before our *Dhamma* was taught *rishis* or seers warded by blasting with curses, our *Dhamma* taught men to make friends of all that might hurt them by sending out a feeling of goodwill to all.

'Then, again, the monks tell us in our last hours not to be afraid of the hereafter if we have tried to be good and heap up merit; we must keep before the mind our good works. It will then not be ill with us, and we shall be reborn in a happy world and for a long time, before we die there, to be again reborn somewhere else. That world will be something like this one, and we shall know it with a new body and

mind. Or, rather, "we" shall not know it: the new body and mind will.

'How we are to get these the monk never tells. I rather think he does not know. Do your clergymen know? He just tells us we shall be born again and again. Sometimes not knowing more worries me. Can there be light about it in the scriptures?

'You see, we don't know what is in our scriptures. Of course, we can all read, but very few can read their old language, the Pali. . . . Some little poems from them are in Sinhalese, like the *Dhammapada*; but those are verses on what we should do, but not teaching about what we are or shall be. There are many words of Pali in our language, but not enough for us to be able to follow the scriptures. Was it ever like that with your Bible, which you have now in English, and all seem to know a good deal?

'When the monks tells us things out of our scriptures they always tell of the better way of the men who are monks, the better fate for the man who is a monk. We value the monks and their way of life, not because we want to be monks ourselves, but because we believe that to take care of monks is the surest way to avoid a dreadful fate after death. Care of them will be all to our credit then. But I do not clearly know who decides in the matter, although I have heard the name Yama mentioned. Do your clergymen know?

'And I suppose that if we thought more about these things, if we believed in them more earnestly, we should really all of us become monks, so as to be safe both here and hereafter. According to the Ceylon chronicles, this did very largely happen when Buddhism was brought to Ceylon. But you see the fact is that once a man becomes a monk, he is not

really "we." We do not see very much of the monks' world; we do not really love their life; we feel they teach and preach mainly for and about themselves.

'What, then, of the man who began that world in Buddhism? We believe that he was not just a man; he was extraordinary, he was a wonder-being. And we believe we others cannot well enter into what he thought. . . . We believe he is no more in any world, either earth or any other, as reborn. It is impossible even to imagine him. We can and do pray to him, we can and do try to meditate on him, on what we are told about him. But we never look for any answer. We believe we shall be somehow better if we meditate and pray—that is all. But that is so with you, isn't it?

'They tell me that now in all countries men are revering the Buddha, yet what can he be to them? He is our Buddha; we have his *Dhamma*; we have his *Sangha*; he mandated it from the beginning—so we believe; he made it. They tell us he did not think so much of the laity as the monk-*sangha*. Sometimes I wonder whether this can be true. Did he not really care so much for us, whose work supports the monk, as well as the old parents and the little children? He was filled, they recite, with great pity for all men; he was the very compassionate as well as the very wise.

'They recite sometimes how he taught a man, Sigala, what a good man should do as a man of the world, not as a monk. Perhaps he did this very often? Men are now, I hear, speaking of him as not above all the *devas* and great *devas* or gods, but as a man who may still be "alive." Will the earth ever see another like him? We believe it will;

another Buddha, Metteyya, but again of India. Do you think there will be another Jesus ? I wish there were a Metteyya here now ! I get very weary of being told there is no way of getting word from him, to tell us much we want to know.

' Sometimes I think, when, as here, I see man believing this here and that there, that we want a messenger and a *dhamma*, or message, for the world, and not for any one country. Sometimes, too, I think we want a helper who when he leaves the earth will not let go of us. Perhaps—it is not orthodox, do you call it, to say so I whisper it—perhaps our Buddha did not want men to let him go into such utter blankness when he left the earth.

' Some of his disciples were able to speak with men of other worlds, just as he did, so they say. Is it perhaps because they did not try to speak to him, to listen lest he might answer, using that sort of rapt musing we learn was called *jnana*, in which they tell us he died ? Christians tell me they can get near Jesus in the sacrament. But to us that seems just a matter of the body. They tell me also of a " holy spirit " who wills or guides in what should be done, and that is a lovely idea. But I seem to want a helper who will give me some light just where the monks at home, as I was saying, do not.

' Our Buddha spoke of the good life as a way, and the monks teach it as an earth-way—that is, how rightly to walk in this life. But then life, they also say, is very, very long ; and beyond this little bit of it we seem to have no good way. We are in the dark. Don't you think the perfect teacher, the helper greater than the gods, would be always helping men—at least till they could themselves see with him the end of the long way approaching ? '

The Buddhist Outlook in China

Dr Hodous says, ' The modern revival of Buddhism may be viewed under four aspects. In recent years there has been great activity in rebuilding ruined monasteries and repairing old ones.

' The second form which the revival has taken is the publication of magazines and books. In 1913 an edition of the Buddhist Canon known as the " Hardoon Reprint " was published. The supplementary Canon was published later. In 1919 a large dictionary of Buddhist terms was issued. Besides these important works a large number of devotional books have been placed at the disposal of the pious layman. There are a number of presses which are devoted entirely to the production of Buddhist literature. Most of the large cities have one or more Buddhist book-stores.

' In recent years there has been a great revival of preaching. This old custom had fallen into desuetude. Recently it has been revived not only in the monasteries, but also in the large cities. Such lectures are well attended by men and women. They are not of a popular character, but consist in the exposition of one of the Sutras. This is done by careful exegesis of the words and clauses with application to modern conditions. Frequently comparison is made with Christianity and other religions.

' In addition to the addresses special institutes have been held for teachers and students in government schools. These are often led by laymen trained in Japan.

' The fourth expression of the new life in Buddhism consists in the social service and religious work for

the poor and the unfortunate. This has taken many forms. It has not developed so far as it has in Japan where several of the Buddhist sects are doing a varied social service. In China the Buddhists have organized the Yellow Swastika Society which corresponds to the Red Cross. They have collected money for famine sufferers and distributed it. They have some orphanages for boys and girls and also schools. These attempts to serve the modern world are not mere imitations of the Christians. They come from the deep aspirations of Buddhists to express their love of all beings in some way adapted to modern conditions.

'Thus far we have summarized the activities of Buddhism in the last three decades. The question is: What is the outlook of Buddhism? There are three distinct tendencies in the Buddhism of China and Japan. The first is the philosophical tendency. The impact of western thought has aroused a number of scholars who are studying Buddhism for the purpose of purging it of its inconsistencies and adapting it to modern thought. This work has proceeded much farther in Japan than in China where it has scarcely begun. These scholars are slowly applying to Buddhism the same canons of criticism that have been applied to the Bible. This work has been hindred in China by the decadence of the monasteries and the general social and political unrest. The universities, however, are turning their attention to the study of religion.

'The second modern tendency is that of the Tantric and Pureland sects, which rely upon magic, exorcism and faith in Amitabha, as a means to escape the ills of this life and to enter the Western Paradise. This tendency is very widespread and,

while it satisfies a large number of people, it acts as a dead weight against progress in religious life and thinking.

'The third tendency is the religious one. This is promoted by T'ai Hsü and his supporters. Their purpose is to adapt Buddhism to modern thought and make it a power in the modern world. They hope by Buddhism to conserve the values of the East and resist the materialism of our industrial society. While the ideas of these reformers are high they have arrayed against them the forces which are making the modern world. Science, industry and democracy are at work on the one hand breaking down the religious conceptions in all countries, and bringing people together. The result is that moral sanctions are melting away and religious systems are everywhere disintegrating.

'While the situation is serious it does not seem to be hopeless. The Buddhists in Japan and China are not only longing for a new brotherhood of all men, but are working for it. They are reaching out for a new internationalism. They are trying to meet the demands of the new age by social service. Still in the midst of it all they are conserving those distinctly religious values which are so dear to the East.

'A number of programmes have been issued. These reveal a new force at work in Buddhism. The Peking Buddhist Association places itself against political oppression, spread of Christianity, anti-religious agitation of the New Thought Movement. These are regarded as outward evils. It also opposes inner evils under which it lists pessimism, the theory of individual salvation and superstition.

'The aims of Buddhists are stated by the Present-day Buddhist Society as (1) uncompromising war against all supernatural religions, such as Christianity, Islam, Brahmanism, Taoism, Confucianism and all other sects; (2) a critical study of science and philosophy; (3) the purging of all impurities from doctrine and practice.

'The Far Eastern Buddhist Convention which met in Japan in 1925 proposed active propagation of Buddhism in Europe and America to be under a board of missions, and the establishment of a missionary training school at Shanghai.

'In order to realize these ends the Buddhists are improving the training of the monks. There is a school at Nanking and one at Wuchang under T'ai Hsü. Both are registered with the ministry of education and their curriculum includes the study of the history of Buddhism, comparative religion, philosophy, psychology and sociology.

'A somewhat new movement is the attempt on the part of a few Chinese to interpret Christianity through Buddhism and to acclimatize Christianity by clothing it in Buddhist forms. The leader of this movement is Chang Ch'un-i who holds that Christianity cannot be understood without Buddhism. He believes that Christianity is the simplest and highest religion, but that it has not been understood by the West and hence has not been truly interpreted by the missionaries. It needs to be clothed in the cultural forms of China and especially those of Buddhism.'

Dr A. K. Reichelt faces the question, 'What are the things by which the Buddhists in China live in the spirit?' and writes as follows:

'The first thing to be said is that the answer will

differ somewhat as we deal with the different schools or sects in Buddhism in China.

'A very large portion of the Pureland sect (Tsing-tu) here have unconsciously advanced along almost theistic lines, centring around the All-Father, the compassionate Amitabha, almost as the Christians centre around God, the Heavenly Father. And this *at-one-ment* with him has been made possible through his God-sent *Bodhisattvas*, especially Kwan-Yin and Tai shih-chih.

'At the same time many of the deepest thinkers and very devoted souls among the Tsing-tu people also realize that the Pureland School is only one of the many ways (the easiest and most practical, although at the same time a difficult way) leading up to salvation. Ultimately this salvation is by these people thought of just as by the thinking and devoted Buddhists in the other schools: It means a coming back to the original source, which means the most exalted bliss and harmony with all obstacles removed as to time and place. It means to have passed through all the spheres of limitations, also that of pleasant, but transient paradises or heavens, to attain to the state of absolute, all-embracing knowledge and wisdom ("boundless light and life").

'The *misery* of all living things is that they have departed from that source (*cheng-su*—the true model or *fah-seng*: the *dharmakaya*), and live their lives in selfish desire and selfish assertion.

'Therefore, all the things which can help a man to come to the right understanding are precious: study, devotion, worship, repentance, communion with the saints, seclusion, pilgrimages, etc. They are all means of cultivating "the good root," they will greatly influence the course of Karma, shorten the

numbers of reincarnations, and, in cases where the work of cultivation is conducted in a perfect whole-hearted way—in a moment set a man free from all bondages and land him securely in the realms of Nirvana. (The idea that Nirvana means extinction of the individuality is entirely absent from their thought. It means extinction of all selfishness and all separate assertion.)

'A great many of the less developed Buddhists will also lay much stress upon *the storing up of merits*, often in a very external way.

'Still I think we may say that most of them really feed upon such things as they really feel help them "to return to the source."

'. . . A similar idea is expressed in the Pureland with these beautiful words: *Wang Seng*, "to go forward to the life." By calling upon the merciful *Bodhisattvas*, or directly calling upon the holy name of Amitabha, by stating in the most solemn and powerful language the great vows, which Amitabha and his helping *Bodhisattvas* have made, the assurance gradually will fill their souls that they themselves are lifted up to the realm of the boundless life and light for which this name stands. The solemn vows are the objective foundation of the faith of the believers —the objective foundation of the atonement.' [1]

The Situation in Japan

The mingling currents of Buddhist and Christian life in Japan are thus ably summarized by Toyohiko

[1] For further details of Buddhist activity in China see *The Eastern Buddhist*, vol. iii. No. 3, pp. 275 ff. This magazine and *Buddhist India* (Calcutta) are scholarly and important publications, which might well be made available to missionaries.

Kagawa, the great social reformer and Christian leader :

'*Zen* was the first Buddhist sect to come close to Christianity in Japan. I have been told that Takatsu Hakuju, the high priest of *Sodo*, one of the subdivisions of *Zen*, even went so far as to help in the translation of the Bible into the Japanese language. And among the *Zen* temples there is one on the foothills of Mt Fuji which has no idol at all, nor even any picture of Divinity. Dr Ikutaro Nishida, professor of philosophy in Kyoto Imperial University, is a philosopher indeed, and one who has studied the mysticism of the Middle Ages (in Europe), and who has had a very great influence upon the common people of Japan. His wife, I have heard, is a Christian. Nishida believes in a personal God, and his philosophical tendency is similar to that of Spinoza. On this account, some of his ideas are like those of the Daijo sect of Buddhism. His book—*Zen no Kenkyu*, "A Study of Righteousness"—has had the power to plant the faith in a personal God in the hearts of a great number of Japanese young people. But Nishida identifies God with the Universe, and never speaks of God as the Creator. He says the true life should be revealed in Christ. But he never goes to a Christian church, nor has he received baptism.

'The work of the *Ittoen* has been greatly influenced by Dr Nishida. And Mr Mozoo Kurata, who brought about the modern revival of *Shinshu*, cannot deny that he was greatly influenced by the philosophy of Dr Nishida. *Shinshu* philosophy to-day is atheistic in its essence, but is being interpreted to the common people as personalistic pantheism. There is in this fact a great inconsistency. The *Shinshu* priests dis-

tinguish between the essence, or substance, and the phenomenal form, and so think the contradiction can be settled. For this reason *Shinshu* is like Christianity, and (of all the Buddhist sects) has made the most of an imitation of Christianity.

'The most tolerant of the Buddhist sects are *Zen* and *Shinshu*. *Nichiren* is the most opposed to Christianity. *Nichiren* has more than ten sub-sects. A revival of *Nichiren* has come about through the essays of Mr Chogyu Takayama. Starting from Nietzscheanism, Mr Takayama proceeded to a study of *Nichiren*, and died as a *Nichiren* believer. Modern *Nichiren* has combined with nationalism and militarism, and so is always in opposition to Christianity, which has the colouring of internationalism. We must not laugh at *Nichiren* for being militaristic, for did not Hegel, who was absolutely pantheistic, think Frederick the Great the representative of the Absolute ?

'It will be easily gathered from the foregoing that Japanese Buddhism—aside from the one militaristic sect—is as tolerant as it is pantheistic. Nowadays we often hear of Buddhist temples being lent for Christian meetings. There is never any such persecution of Christianity in Japan, even by the most zealous of the Buddhists, as there is on the part of Mohammedanism. The *Shingon* sect goes so far as to exchange professors every year with the Theological Department of Kwansei Gakuin. The Buddhists now gladly co-operate with Christians in work for temperance and for the abolition of the social evil. Christian teachers study the religious experience of Buddhism, and admire the religious experience of Eckhardt and Jacob Boehme. They think of the priests of *Zen*, with their pantheistic mysticism, as

prophetic forerunners of Christ, and believe that these priests have paved the way for His coming. Mr Hakuma Kaneko, the pastor of the Nagoya Congregational Church, is the most characteristic writer among these Christian scholars.[1] Another who is expressing the same tendency is Mr Soetsu Yanagi. The latter says that the Buddhist doctrine of *Mu* is the way to God. (This *Mu* is the nothingness of relativity, the denial of phenomena. When we want to worship God, we must deny everything phenomenal.) With the logic of the *Zen* sect, he considers this is the way to God for the Orientals. He adopts *Zen* and *Shinshu* principles, and through those sects approaches the prayer of Jesus and of Christianity. So though he does not go to church, he understands Christianity from the Oriental point of view, through his personal experience. His famous book on God is very similar to the mysticism of Mme Guyon. It is very remarkable that he has tried to harmonize the Christianity of the Middle Ages with Buddhism.

'A tendency of this kind has appeared in Dr Anesaki. About twenty-five years ago Dr Anesaki was influenced by Hartmann and Schopenhauer, and insisted upon a philosophical religion. Later, being influenced by his friend Mr Takayama, he studied the Hokekkyo, and has since been trying to harmonize the essence of Christianity with Buddhist principles. The Kiitsu Kyokwai was an effort at syncretism organized by Dr Anesaki and his friends, who wanted to bring Christianity, Buddhism and Shintoism together into one. In Dr Anesaki, the Buddhist influence was greater than that of Christianity, but in Yanagi the Christian element is greater than the

[1] See Appendix A.

Buddhist element, though he studied Oriental mysticism.

'Probably we may consider that the young idealists of Japan, though they do not come to church, have an inclination similar to that of Mr Yanagi. I received the impression when I visited the seminaries of the Buddhist priests that there is almost no difference between the Christian and Buddhist theological seminaries. The Nishi Honganji Seminary has about five hundred young priests studying their doctrines, and they are so liberal that they are considering Buddhism in the light of European pantheism. Therefore we may consider the Buddhism of Japan to-day as rather inclined to the European pantheism of Hegel and Schopenhauer than to that of the old Indian philosophers. They are reconsidering, or restudying, the Buddhist with the Indian canons, with a new standpoint of European pantheism. Therefore their ideas are very near to Christianity. If you use the term God instead of their accustomed word Buddha, many of their ideas will have no distinction from those of Christianity.

'This remarkable tendency is shown in the religious worship at the *Ittoen*. The *Ittoen* has harmonized the Buddhist monasticism with that of the Franciscans. In the *Ittoen* Order there are many Christians and many Buddhists, the central figure of the Order being Dr Nishida, a Buddhist. But the one who introduced Dr Nishida to the public was a Christian, a Mr Yasuzaimon Miyazaki, a Franciscan in his spirit and his life. The *Ittoen* rituals are mostly taken from the *Shin* sect, but they read the Sermon on the Mount before the image of the Buddha, and beat the wooden prayer drum (*mokugyo*) as they worship. I have been told that Dr Nishida, when asked to write some-

thing by any one, usually writes centrally of the Cross, and, beside it, of reverence to the Buddha. When there happens to be a majority of Christians in the *Ittoen*, people have told me that they read the Bible ; when the majority is Buddhist, they read the *Yumakyo* at the morning services. The *Ittoen* people are very generous. In their social service they do not make any distinction between Christians and Buddhists. In both the Buddhist and the Christian members of the Order, charity is their main emphasis. They lay more emphasis upon it than upon doctrines. They go to help wherever asked to do so, without making any distinction between Buddhists and Christians. They freely attend both Buddhist temples and Christian churches. They assume a position of indifference toward the doctrinal side expressed in words. For instance, Dr Nishida's right-hand man, Mr Kitsuye Matsushita, deserted his inheritance of several tens of thousands of yen and went out in lowly service (at the *Ittoen*). He keeps the rituals of the *Shin* sect, and has written a history of Christian Socialism, in which he expressed his ideas. The recent approach of Buddhism to Christianity on the part of these people is rather in action than in doctrines. The Buddhist approach of the earlier Meiji period was from the doctrinal side. Their attitude has greatly shocked and stimulated the intellectuals of Japan, so that the distance between Christianity and Buddhism in Japan has been greatly diminished. For them the disputes on words and doctrines have lost their interest. They want to reveal to the public that to the religion of the Good Samaritan belongs the final victory. But unfortunately the Communist movement in Japan has just now attracted more of the attention of the public

than the *Ittoen*, so that the latter flame is burning low at present.

'But we cannot deny that there are many young men who are thinking like the people in the *Ittoen*. It is very difficult to get a victory for Christianity over Buddhism from the philosophical side, because the philosophical trend in Japan is identical with that of western philosophy, and if the latter inclines to pantheism, Buddhism will rise in Japan; while if western thought becomes personalistic, Christianity will prosper.

'But the present religious inclination of the young men of Japan is rather departing from philosophy, and they are attracted more and more to the personal experience of religion through the service of love. Therefore if Christianity wants to conquer Buddhism we must stop arguing about doctrines and love the Buddhists! And unless Christians arise who serve more devotedly than the members of the *Ittoen* Order, probably we cannot demonstrate the truth of the Cross to the Buddhist people.

'As Buddhism is a very generous religion, probably they will not hesitate to add Christ some day to the pantheon of the *Shingon* sect as one of their Buddhas. And if Christianity grows a little more in Japan, the Buddhists will probably hang the picture of Christ in their temples and worship it. In the Mikawa Agricultural School central hall Christ, Buddha and Confucius are worshipped together, in the shrine called *Sanseido*, the shrine of the three saints. In government hospitals they allow us to use the Buddhist temple as a Christian meeting-place. Very frequently we put a curtain up in front of the image of Buddha and begin to sing hymns. This tendency is very general among primary school teachers of

Japan to-day. As Shintoism was sucked into Buddhism, there is danger that the monotheism of Christianity may be sucked into the pantheism of Buddhism.

'If we approach from the doctrinal side, probably the common school teachers of Japan will not have the courage to adopt Christianity as the sole truth rather than all other religions. Therefore the future victory of Christianity depends upon the Christian love shown in practical life, so that the love of Christ being shown in His death on the Cross is greater than the death of Buddha. Through love we must try to show that God's love through the Cross is greater than the death of Buddha. The Japanese are tired of arguments, and doctrinal sermons make lumps rise in their ears like the lumps on the camel's back! Here lies the message of Christianity in Japan: Unless the love of Christianity is greater than that of Buddhism, it is very difficult to lead the Buddhist to Christ.'

IV. CONCLUSION

Here is a ringing challenge which comes out of a very rich practical experience—to show God's glory in the Cross, to draw the peoples of Japan to Him not by argument but by love. When this young and ardent leader speaks, thousands of Japanese are ready to follow him and his Master.

If the founder of Buddhism is essentially a mystic teaching a way of conduct, the Founder of Christianity is essentially a great Shepherd of souls revealing a God of Love. And though Jesus was also

a mystic—the great Mystic—and Sakyamuni also a great elder brother, yet the contrast is clear and can be clearly seen if we set side by side testimonies of their first disciples.

An early follower thus describes Sakyamuni :

> Buddha, Awakened, Brother of mankind,
> Controlled and rapt from things without
> To inner vision, glad of heart and calm . . .
> Rejoicing to renounce the lures of sense is he,
> As gold well purified from earthy dross.
> Lo ! as some mighty elephant, superb
> Amidst Himalayan forest ways he goes
> So rapt in meditation, breathing deep
> Composed is he in body and in mind.
> Freely he passes wheresoe'er he will.
> As some pure lotus bloweth undefiled
> So liveth he, the Uncontaminate.[1]

It is a fine picture of an Indian seer. But Sakyamuni is also teacher, physician of sick souls, prophet of a new *Dharma* for the individual and for society. He preaches a universe of justice, and teaches man how to work with it and to find joy in doing so.

Jesus is the Prophet of a Father God—intensely aware of human need and sin, calling men to a true knowledge of God, and seeking to establish the kingdom of the Spirit. Himself radiant with the certainty of God and of His ultimate victory, He bids men be of good cheer, and gives them new and often paradoxical standards of human conduct. Finding themselves in a new relation to the Father, they are to set up a new human society—whatever the cost. He is Himself Friend of Sinners and Suffering Servant of God—His Father and theirs.

'Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit'

[1] Theragatha, ccxlvii.

were His dying words; and one who knew Him most intimately says of Him:

> For when he suffered for you he left you an example,
> And it is for you to follow in his footsteps:
> Who committed no sin, nor was guile found on his lips:
> Who was reviled and made no retort,
> Who suffered and uttered no threat,
> But left all to Him who judges justly.
> He bore our sins in his own flesh upon the Cross,
> That we might break with sin and live uprightly:
> By whose wounds we have been healed.
> You were astray as sheep but are returned
> Now to the shepherd and guardian of your souls.[1]

Thus while the companions of Sakyamuni represent him as the serene, strong, calm example of what his followers are to be—a *yogi* of a well-known Indian type—the companions of Jesus represent Him as not only an Example of patient suffering and sinless love but as the Shepherd and Guardian—a Suffering Messiah of a type familiar to the more spiritually minded of the Jews.

Each group uses categories well known in its old traditions of spiritual life. But neither group can rest satisfied with these. Jesus is for the early Church more than the fulfilment of old Hebrew ideals; Sakyamuni is for the early Buddhists more than a great seer. In what does the uniqueness of each consist?

In answering this question we are faced at once with the difficult problems of textual criticism: the Sakyamuni of history largely eludes us, and we have to choose between several interpretations offered us by his own followers Is he the 'Elder Brother of Men,' or 'a God over the Gods'; is he human or divine? Buddhists are far from agreeing about him.

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 21–25.

The Jesus of history we may claim, with Weinel, 'to know full well'; yet there are the Synoptic, the Pauline and the Johannine interpretations to be weighed. Personally, I find it helpful to believe that both great Teachers were consistent and creative thinkers: that a view of each, therefore, must be found which is coherent and free of contradictions. Thus the Johannine Christ is in some ways a truer picture than the Synoptic Jesus. To Him God is Father, and the apocalyptic element in His teachings is sublimated and consistent with this love of the Father, as it is not always in the other Gospels. Yet much in them is obviously better fact, if it is less adequate interpretation of fact.

In the same way Sakyamuni is not the rationalist of the Neo-Buddhism of to-day so much as the good physician of the Neo-Buddhism of the first century A.D., and whilst he is the Elder Monk and Brother of men depicted by the monks of the *Theravada* tradition of Ceylon and Burma he is also no less the Wise Teacher of the *Mahayana*, adapting his teaching with 'loving strategy' to all classes of men. Sakyamuni is in a word the personification of the *Dharma*, or Teaching; Jesus is the Incarnate Logos. The Buddhist is invited to see in the Sakyamuni of the *Lotus* Eternal Truth; the Christian to see in the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel the True God. These at any rate are clean-cut and practical appeals, and they are accepted by the great mass of Buddhists and Christians respectively. The *Lotus* is on every Buddhist altar in Japan; the Fourth Gospel is for millions of Christians as for Luther 'far to be preferred above the others.'

For each gives men a Lord worthy of worship, and cheers them with comfortable words and assur-

ances of divine help. If each is a series of dramatic monologues rather than a biography, it is just as full of power for the believer who accepts its historic basis.

Yet both are continually assailed. In the West we find Dr Kirsopp Lake, while accepting the Logos Christology as 'the central doctrine of Catholic theology,' rejecting it as 'unknown to Jesus and to those who first recorded His life'; and as belonging to 'a general form of thought which is alien to the world to-day.'[1] Fortunately, we have also the Dean of St Paul's commending it to us as 'our hope for the future.'[2]

The *Lotus* scripture, accepted by Japanese and Chinese Buddhists as the 'very cream of orthodoxy,' 'the crown-jewel of the Sutras,' and as a point of contact with the Christian Church, is roundly condemned by the Buddhists of the South as hopelessly heterodox and unhistorical. No critic would press the strict historical accuracy of either great book; but each satisfies large masses of devout people and of scholars not a few. For each offers what seems a gospel; each rejects any docetic interpretation of the Founder; each is a classical expression of the religion of the spirit 'based on a firm belief in absolute and eternal values as the most real things in the universe.'

How then do they differ? What is the unique thing in Christianity? Why should we offer the Fourth Gospel to Asia, which, having the *Lotus* and the *Bhagavad Gita*, seems well content? It needs a book to answer this question![3] Here I offer a few thoughts and invite discussion.

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1925. [2] *Hulsean Lectures*, I, 1925.
[3] See Saunders, Kenneth, *The Gospel for Asia*, recently published by Macmillan.

1. The Personality of Jesus—whether we interpret Him as Logos or not—is a Personality of which the eastern world has need. It has no clear doctrine of Personality in God and man: for while its heart proclaims such doctrine in its *bhakti*-cults, and millions actually worship Sakyamuni and Krishna, its head keeps murmuring *maya*, illusion, *lila*, sport, *upaya*, device of the Teacher—the *hoben* of Japan. Of the Man Jesus we can know more, and there is more to know than of the historic Krishna, or even of Sakyamuni. Secondly, this historic Person has been more clearly thought out.

2. The Fourth Gospel is the crowning achievement of the ethical monotheism of the Hebrews, and we offer it to Asia, saying, 'That which satisfied the Greek world with its long philosophical history you need not be ashamed to accept.' 'God manifest in the flesh,' says J. Pringle-Pattison, 'is a more profound philosophic truth than the loftiest flight of speculation, that outsoars all predicates, and for the greater glory of God declares Him unknowable.' [1] The Johannine Christ is more real and more historical than the Sakyamuni of the *Lotus*, who is himself the proof that no one but the stoical monk was satisfied with the Sakyamuni of the Pali texts. Man demands not a Teacher so much as a Saviour.

3. A third differentia of the Christian religion is the social ethic of Jesus, of the kingdom of God as the Synoptists record it, of love and the life eternal as it appears in the Fourth Gospel. Asia has need of a social ethic freed from the incubus of Karma, and inspired by the free spirit of love. She will find also in the ideal of eternal life, begun in time, a ful-

[1] *The Idea of God*, p. 157.

filling of her continual search for *moksha*, freedom, and Nirvana, extinction of passion.

4. In the fourth place Christianity offers the Cross as at once the best revelation of God's glory and of man's noble constancy to truth. The Johannine interpretation appeals to the Buddhist whose own religious needs have called into being the stories of the *Bodhisattvas*, suffering for others. Over some of these—as told in the *Jataka* book—we might write: 'Greater love hath no man than this—that a man lay down his life for his friends.' We cannot write that other great Johannine summary: 'I if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me.'

That Asia needs the 'offence of the Cross' seems clear. She has groped after it in her doctrine of Shiva, whose sacrifice is hymned by the medieval Tamil Manikkar Vachakar:

> Thou mad'st me Thine: did'st fiery poison eat,
> That I might eat with Thee the food of heaven,
> I, meanest one, O Thou Compassionate.

And Buddhism holds out its arms to the Cross in its long history of mythical heroes whom it loves, but knows to be ideals, not persons. Japan has strangely ignored the *Jataka* tales, which tell of suffering, but she is beginning to realize the Johannine view of the Suffering God—most glorious when so revealed.

Dr Reichelt says:

'After a period of work among the Buddhists stretching over the space of about twenty-four years, it is my inmost and sincere conviction that only by presenting Jesus Christ as the very special and unique revealer of the eternal Logos (*Tao*), as is done in the Fourth Gospel, can the deeper religious souls

among the Buddhists be reached by the Christian message.

'At the same time the greatest stress must be placed upon the *secure and true historicity of Jesus Christ.*

'Many, many of them feel that the weakest point in the Buddhist religion is the vague and uncertain tradition in regard to the Amitabha idea, the Kwan-yin idea, etc.

'By following the Johannine way of describing Christ, securely rooted in history and at the same time super-historical, all-embracing and divine, the image of Christ will become indigenous to them.

'Having caught that vision of Christ it will be possible for them to enter into the real sanctuary of the Christian faith, the supreme experience of meeting God along personal lines as a *Father.*

'That there really is a longing for such an experience by many of the most devoted Buddhists is a fact to which I can testify.

'Progress along this line means also a deepening of the sense of personal sin and unworthiness—and the deeper understanding of the secret of the Cross will correspondingly grow forth.

'I could tell of many remarkably sacred hours with the really religious Buddhists when we together pondered upon the wonderful story of Calvary. "Certainly here the *Bodhisattva* doctrine has reached its climax!" So often I heard something like this.

'Among the devotees belonging to the *Chang-tsung* (School of Meditation) I have found an outspoken interest in the writings of St Paul, especially in his sayings about the struggle in the soul, when "the commandment came and sin revived." Expressions such as these: "But I see in my members

another law, warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity," give a classical picture of the awful drama which so often is played in the quiet hours in the cells and meditation halls.

'The wonderful parallel to the Buddhist doctrine about the two wheels (the wheel of Karma and the wheel of Salvation), found in the first two verses of Romans viii., has not escaped their mind: "For the law of the Spirit of life . . . hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

'In the Pureland school the wonderful sayings about "justification through faith" and the triumph song of victory given in the eighth chapter of Romans, are very much appreciated.

'I feel the religious souls here must be led forward along these Johannine and Pauline lines and abundant "points of contact" can here be utilized.'

If, then, these are the gifts of Christ to Asia it is clear that the mission of the Church is not fulfilled till she has given them in an acceptable form. The Fourth Gospel may well be that form: but it awaits an eastern interpreter. Certainly he will remind us of the Travailing God who works continually in His universe, and will emphasize, as we have not done, a Johannine *advaita* (non-duality) which is implied in the Discourse of the Vine, and in the Prologue to the Gospel.

But our western interpretations of Jesus, even the Johannine, are not final. The richly dowered nations of Asia will not permanently refuse what Jew and Greek and Roman accepted, but they will make it their own as these did. In doing this they will surely reveal yet more clearly the universality of the Son of Man.

The task of the missionary is to hand on the rich

experience of the Church, and to enter into partnership with the people of Asia in a great spiritual quest. It will become increasingly clear, as the mystically-minded followers of Christ meet with men of like temperament in Buddhism, that they have already much in common : and already some of the best of these Buddhist leaders are saying, ' We see your Christ because we have seen our Buddha.' Others are saying that, at any rate for the masses, Christianity makes possible the ideals which Buddhism holds out.

' To do good, to shun evil, to cleanse the innermost heart '—this is the old ideal of Buddhist ethics, and it is, like the Sermon on the Mount, quite unattainable except in the strength of a divine helper.

The Christian, called to be ' perfect ' (or loving) as the Father in Heaven, will agree with the Buddhist in crying, ' Who is sufficient for these things ? '

APPENDIX A

A Statement by H. Kaneko San, Japan, Congregational Church, Nagoya

1. JAPAN has a history of 2500 years ; and for half of it, or 1300 years, the Japanese people have been influenced by Buddhism. So that religion has exerted on the spiritual life of the Japanese a deep influence. Japanese life owes to Buddhism as much as European life owes to Christianity. It is rooted deeply in the daily life, thought, philosophy of life and cosmology of the Japanese people.

The real life of Buddhism, at present, may be not so strong as in the past ; yet it still gives something

to the heart of the common people—especially to the heart of the aged, of women, of people of the lower classes and even of cultured young men.

Buddhism had (and has) a great influence upon the arts—painting, sculpture, tea-ceremony, way of writing, poetry, novels, songs and drama; and the influence is so great that it cannot be compared to the small influence of the Japanese Christianity of to-day.

We have great quantities of Buddhist literature, namely, the commentaries of its dogmas, according to each sect, historical records, lives of great priests and stories of good believers; and all of them are very beautiful records. I believe that some of them are deeper and greater in their significance and value than those of Christian literature in Europe.

We cannot afford to forget, of course, that some are receiving a bad influence from the negative (or static) thought of Buddhism; yet I dare say the spiritual power of Buddhism is something greater and better than western peoples realize.

2. To what extent there will be harmony between Buddhism and Christianity is one of the great questions of to-day. The answer not only determines the future of Japan, but it determines the future of the world.

I state my opinion frankly: Japanese Christianity seems much better on its formal and social sides than Buddhism, but I question how much greater Christianity, as it is in Japan to-day, is in its inner depth and spiritual experience. I maintain that men must appreciate the greatness of Buddhism in its inner, spiritual and experimental life.

3. The living sects of Buddhism in the present spiritual world of Japan are (*a*) the *Zen*-sect; (*b*) the

Shin-sect; and (*c*) the *Nichiren*-sect, and no more than those three.

Zen is the greatest in its depth of thought, experience and mystical intuition. The Truth preached by Dogen and Hakuen became the centre of the spiritual life of the nation. The *Shin*-sect was established by Shinran, and this sect lives through its devotional nature, and it is a popular religion, true and easy to believe. The *Nichiren*-sect is the religion of fiery earnestness, with its founder, Nichiren; and it is very earnest in evangelism even to-day.

But these qualities of the three sects are all to be absorbed into the contents of Christianity, or to be harmonized with Christianity, I think. *Zen*, in its mystical intuition; *Shin*, in its devotional spirit, or in its pure sentiment of faith; and *Nichiren*, in its constantly strong will—these will be harmonized with Christianity.

These three sects represent our Japanese Buddhism of to-day (*a*) in its intellectual insight, (*b*) in its devotional faith, and (*c*) in its voluntary activity. These three seem to have some possibility of going hand in hand with Christianity, as brothers; and of getting on progressively, each in its own way of realization.

Among the three the *Nichiren*-sect is somewhat exclusive; and it may be difficult for this sect to go hand in hand with others. But the *Zen* and *Shin* will work together in the future.

If, in the near future of Japan, religions go on in the new way, breaking up their old forms—the *Zen* and *Shin* uniting first with each other—then this new sect will join hands with Christianity. This thought of mine may be laughed at by some missionaries as a dream.

4. There are many Buddhists who were converted to Christianity from their earnest faith in Buddhism.

Buddhism is apt to go to its extremes in its intellectual research (or, some go to unscientific superstition : this is not the fault of Buddhism itself, but the fault of priests) ; and it is apt to forget the supreme value of personality. But Christianity respects personality, and its ethical colour is very rich. And this is the reason why many Buddhists are converted to Christianity.

Mr Ryoun Kamegae, who was converted from Buddhist priest to Christian pastor, is very happy since he became a Christian. He seems very proud of his experience, the spiritual and ethical experience of having intercourse with a living Christ.

APPENDIX B

WHAT I BELIEVE

By Ishizuka San, Japan, Joint Author of *Honen* and Priest of the *Jodo* Sect

I

WE know by experience that the law of impermanency and of interdependence rules in all things in the universe. From the dynamic point of view all things are subject to change, being produced by causes and conditions. Nature is changing without a moment's stay. Though invisible to our naked eye, the position of the stars and the intensity of their light are constantly changing. Even the heat of the sun is gradually cooling. Grasses

and trees, birds and beasts have been transformed through all ages. The human world is not an exception to the rule. Again observe the phenomena from the statical point of view and you will find that they are all well arranged in good order and in harmonious relation with one another. From heavenly bodies to human society nothing can be seen isolated (with no exception of such supposed things as electrons), planets keeping their places in attraction with one another, animals unable to preserve their lives without the help of plants. Further, everything in the universe is so closely connected with everything else that one cannot have its being without the help of all others, and that one is equal to many in its importance or value.

II

We find the *Dharma* or Law in all things when we see them as they really are. The *Dharma* is ' boundless outward in the whole, and boundless inward in the atom.' It is the first and last principle by which all things in the universe are controlled and placed in their proper places. It shows itself in the law of causality and of retribution from the very beginning of the universe. We have no external creator or upholder of it. God, if any, in Buddhism is the *Dharma.* He exists in the sense of life or the power of the universe in itself. We experience Him in the harmonious order of things, in the intelligible and merciful activity of nature, or in the conscientious motive of human beings. The Buddha *Dharmakaya* is the name of the *Dharma* when it is personified. It is beyond the power of thinking in its essence except for Buddha, the enlightened one. It is

conceived as the life which is perfectly free from all impurities and at the same time full of innumerable virtues.

III

We know that we, as individuals, are self-conscious beings by experience. We are each in fact an ego, no more and no less. Being the master of *karma*, each one is a future Buddha striving after the life of truth, or of the *Dharma*. We deny the unique, self-existent entity of ego. We need no such hypothesis as that the soul is immortal, for a continuation of life is possible to be conceived as an ever-changing composite unit. Our body is not the so-called ego, nor the mind. Dismember the limbs and you have injured nothing in your selves; cease using some of the five senses and also we remain the same within. Even when we have no perception, ideas, feeling or thoughts, we are the same in our being, if we have the body. But there is no mind where there is no body, and vice versa. Thus we see that a self consists in the combination of the mind and body (Skr. *panca skandhah*, five elements). Though ever-changing like a torrent and not pausing for a moment, the so-called composite self is existent for ever (see *Honen*, ch. xviii, p. 357). This is what we call the doctrine of ' non-ego ' (Skr. *anatman*).

IV

We admit that the composite self has ignorance (Skr. *avidya*), which has arisen since time began. It prevents us from knowing things as they are, and we have perverted views, troubles and vices. Ignorance is the fountain-head of all forms of human

vices—covetousness and anger, pride and doubt. From the former two comes injustice, such as greed, hatred and cruelty; from the latter two we have bigotry or superstition which denies scientific knowledge and religious truth in others, and excites passion for class and racial struggles. When ignorance is dispelled all evils, personal as well as social, will disappear, there coming into being the pure and genuine life of truth, for which our human nature (Skr. *buddhatva*) has been seeking from the beginning. Hence religion.

V

We believe that there were and will be a great many persons who seek after the genuine life of truth, or of enlightenment. Those who have attained the goal we call the Buddhas of reward or accomplishment (Skr. *Sambhoga-kaya*). Some of the Buddhas exercise great influence upon us, while others do not. For the former we have deep affection, because we understand them. We call them the Buddhas of adaptation (Skr. *Nirmanakaya*), because they are pleased to teach us what they have realized according to our faculties and conditions. In former times we had a large number of great men, Confucius, Sakyamuni, Socrates, Jesus and Mohammed, whom we regard with great reverence. These great men must have attained perfection in their character in realizing in themselves the life of truth. They practised every form of moral discipline with the utmost effort, which resulted in the highest degree of human attainment. Viewed in this light they might be called men of highest character wrought out or rewarded by their effort. They would, therefore, have been equally qualified to be

looked up to as men of light and leadership. But it is not always true that they won the heart of every man. Some were accepted by the educated classes, others by the lower classes and still others by the unlettered. In the eyes of those who took refuge in them, the great men were the persons of adaptation or saviours to them. To Christians Jesus of Nazareth is Christ, the Saviour, or the Buddha of adaptation in Buddhist terminology, while to a Buddhist he is not a saviour or Buddha of adaptation, but a perfect man or a person of reward. Sakyamuni, who was born in India in the fifth century B.C., has a special affinity for us Buddhists because of his personality, which is suitable to us as a spiritual teacher, and we look up to him as the Buddha of adaptation. This is why we are Buddhists.

VI

As Sakyamuni is our personal Buddha of adaptation, we adore him as the model of our conduct; his teachings we follow; his principles we wish to propagate among all people of the world.

If we enquire into the life of Sakyamuni, we find that he lived a life of purity and enlightenment, sinking his own interests for the sake of others. He showed us the true state of things originating from illusion or ignorance, and taught the way of deliverance from it, and at the same time he advised us to have faith in the Buddhas of the past. The teachings of the so-called noble fourfold truth (Skr. *catvari aryani satyani*), and the four ways in conduct in life (Skr. *catvari sangraha vastuni*), etc., belong to the former, and the latter is the faith in the Buddha's power, which, having disappeared for several hundred

years after Sakya's Nirvana, came again to the world about 100 B.C. in a new form of faith in the Buddha of boundless life and light (Skr. *Amitayus Buddha*).

VII

We believe in the existence of the Buddha Amitāyus, whose light of salvation is always shining upon all sentient beings. Jesus was crucified on the Cross about 1900 years ago, but is alive even now in the hearts of Christians as Christ the Saviour. The followers of *Nichiren* believe in the eternal existence of the true person of Sakyamuni, or *Sambhoga-kaya*, who perfectly realized in himself the truth of the highest Law (Skr. *Saddharma*) innumerable *kalpas* ago. In the same way we followers of *Honen* believe in the Buddha Amita as *Sambhoga-kaya* who attained the highest perfect knowledge ten *kalpas* ago. He not only redeemed us from the bondage of sin, but also piled up merits to deserve one's birth into that Buddha Land of perfect Bliss. The very indefectible virtues of these accumulated merits he concentrated in his own name, wishing all sentient beings to appropriate the same by calling upon his name, and promising that whenever any would from their hearts so call on him, he would grant them birth into his Pure Land of Nirvana. This birth is the so-called 'new birth' or regeneration of *Jodo* Buddhism, under the operation of Amita's great compassion, in which our sinful or egotistical tendencies of life become reversed, and has paved the way for us to lead a life of wisdom and build up a new world of purity and righteousness.

Thus when our call comes, we are to be received into Amita's Pure Land, where we all naturally reach

the perfection of our character or the Buddhahood and then come back again to earth in order to devote ourselves to the work of salvation for ever. This never-ceasing free activity of the enlightened is called in Sanskrit *Apratisthita nirvana*, i.e. Nirvana never stopping anywhere (see *Honen*, ch. xviii, p. 358). For Nirvana does not mean a cessation or annihilation, but a full emancipation or life full of activity in the *Mahayana* Buddhism.

A comparison of Buddhism and Christianity brings out the following points :

1. Buddhism, denying the Creator of the universe, admits that there is an eternal, all-comprehensive spiritual being called *Dharma*, which is compared to the Christian God. It asserts that the highest human attainment is a divine perfection, that is, the Buddha of accomplishment or reward, which is quite akin to the idea of omnipotence and omniscience of God. Christ as the manifestation of God's love seems to me to be like the Buddha of adaptation. With regard to the pre-existence of Christ (as stated in John's Gospel), we Buddhists have a corresponding idea in the *Saddharma pundalika* (see *Honen*, p. 98). The Holy Spirit seems to have the same power as that of the *Sila* Spirit (Jap. *Kai-tai*) or Buddha-nature (*Buddhatva*) in Buddhism (*Honen*, ch. iv, n. 1, p. 149). A Buddhist who has taken a vow of obedience to the Buddha's precepts is conscious of being aided by the abiding influence of the *Sila* Spirit which has been aroused in his heart at the time of his making the vow. Here we have a Buddhist Trinity, namely, unity of the three persons—Dharmakaya, Sambhogakaya and Nirmaṇakaya, and the *Sila* Spirit.

2. Though the *anatman* doctrine of Buddhism rejects every thought of ego or soul-entity, still it

admits of an eternal continuation of individual life of Karma or truth in the sense of being perfectly free from the idea of ego, even after one's attainment of Nirvana. The idea of ego is the fundamental impediment to the life of truth. So long as we are not thoroughly convinced of the truth of 'non-ego,' we are not able to love our neighbours as ourselves; much less our enemy; still less free from the feeling of distinction of friend and enemy (Jap. *onshin byodo*). Compare Matthew v. 45, 46. Moreover, if we have any idea of ego at all, we are at the same time possessed by the desire of something to have for our own use, which is the origin of all social evils, there coming into existence the conception of ownership, and then the system of private property, which results in unjust accumulation or misuse of wealth. Hence non-possession in Buddhism.

3. There is no idea of remission of sin in Buddhism, as there is no God in the sense of the Ruler of all things in the universe. We Buddhists, however, hold the law of retribution, and consequently have an idea of redemption. The Buddha Amitayus, when in the state of unenlightenment, went on with the practice of all austerities through innumerable *kalpas* of time and that only for the sake of sinners or common mortals as the ground of redemption. This is very similar to the idea of Christian redemption, or of vicarious salvation, and you may easily see 'salvation by faith' in *Honen's* Buddhology as in Pauline theology; not to mention repentance as the only initiative to the life of faith common in both religions. It is perhaps due to these similarities that we have often in Japan fervent Christian converts out of *Jodo* Shinsuist families, who afterwards confess that they had no reason but mood for their conversion.

4. Another point I must call to your attention is that there seems to be a great difference between the two religions in regard to the state of existence after death. Christianity has an idea of eternal life, in acceptance of which a Christian enjoys a life of peace with God in heaven, whereas a Buddhist, especially a Jodoist, believes that, when he is admitted into the Pure Land of the Buddha Amitayus, he hastens to attain to perfect enlightenment there. On attaining to it he at once comes back again to earth in order to devote himself to the work of salvation according to his own original vow. For Buddhahood is not to be sought for one's own sake, but for all sentient beings. This endless free activity of enlightenment is the very state of Nirvana conceived of by Japanese *Mahayana* Buddhists.

In conclusion I should like to say that it is the Buddhist idea of 'non-ego' and of Nirvana that trained the Japanese mind to a liberal and tolerant mood toward different tenets of various religions, which shows itself in our national aspiration after an ever-renewing life of peace.

APPENDIX C

MODERN TENDENCIES OF BURMESE BUDDHISM

By U Maung Kin, Burma, Member of the Legislative Assembly

THE word 'modern' is difficult to define, but the year 1917 may well be regarded for the purposes of this paper as the beginning of a period to which the term modern can be applied. Barely a

decade ago—but what changes have taken place! The Great World War was being waged in the West, bringing ruin and devastation all around; the cause of smaller states and weaker nations was being championed as had never been done hitherto; the world's outlook on life and on things in general was changing with an intensity and a rapidity that the years of peace could not have dreamed of. And it was in the year 1917 that the British Parliament made the famous announcement regarding the grant of responsible government for India. This has for the Burman a meaning and an import deeper far, perhaps, than that ever imagined by its progenitors. The wave of western influence which came with the conquerors and which swept over Burma was just then making itself felt; old problems were being examined in the light of new ideas; attempts were made to adjust the old with the new; a spirit of restlessness prevailed everywhere. The times were changed and changing. A vague feeling there was, too, that something was wanting, something was needed, something had yet to be added on. What it was, nobody dared define, but still there was a striving to satisfy that desire. But with the Parliamentary announcement of 1917, alongside of which appeared new thoughts, new visions, new ideas, and it may be added a new language, a new impetus was given to that absorbing search, and modern tendencies of Burmese Buddhism, as of Burmese literature or of Burmese political thought, might well date from that year.

With the overthrow of the last Burmese dynasty in 1885, the Burmese lost their 'Defender of the Faith' and, as the Burman cannot conceive of a religion without a defender of the faith, the downfall

of the Burmese monarchy, according to the people's notions, left the nation without a religion. Despite the Queen's proclamation of 1853 regarding non-interference in religious matters, despite the reinstallation by the British Government of the *Thathanadaing*—the head of the Buddhist hierarchy—despite the revival of the *Patamabyan* (Pali Scripture) examinations, the Burman had viewed the advent of a Christian government, the introduction of what he considered un-Buddhistic teachings in the schools, with something of a suspicious eye. Buddhism as professed by the Burman is neither militant nor aggressive, but is strongly suspicious of new faiths and new creeds. And a new régime might mean the disruption of and disintegration of the doctrines which they hold dear. That idea had been current all along. It might be openly professed or else subtly suppressed, but it was there all the same, and so the vision of Home Rule . . . signified for the Burman what, for want of a better term, might be called the millennium. The Burman cannot and will not differentiate nationalism from religion and to him to be a Burman is to be a Buddhist. . . . I may say at the very outset that the tenets of Buddhism cannot suffer any change, though the attitude of a Buddhist towards his religion is capable of changing and has to a considerable extent changed. Burma is no longer the isolated region that she was in the past. She is becoming a part of the westernized world. Western thoughts, western ideas, western notions drift towards Burma through the medium of what might be called the new learning. Newspapers and magazines, periodicals and pamphlets issued by Burmans, most of which are bilingual, have a marked effect on their countrymen's minds. With the

advent of the precursor to the Constitutional Reforms, the political reawakening of the masses, a tide of new thought seemed to have crept on the Burman. The politician's cry had been and still is, 'Burman nationality, language and religion,' and the political propagandist appeals invariably for the preservation of these three things, for as I have said before the Burman cannot conceive of these being separated. Political influences therefore intensify rather than diminish the faith in Buddhism. In the early days of the political movement the *pongyis* (priests) sedulously kept aloof, and the number of those participating in politics as such could be counted on one's fingers. This state of affairs was for a time inconsistent with the statement in the *Upper Burma Gazette*, in the chapter on 'Religion and Its Semblances,' wherein it was made out that there are few phenomena more striking than the prominent part taken by the *pongyis* of Upper Burma in the political life of the country. But that was not long to be. The political movement of the day was suffering from the want of propagandists, and the leaders sought the sympathy, secured the support, enlisted the aid of the *pongyis*. Their active participation in politics may not be in keeping with the cold, stern precepts of the Great Master, but justification for the action was found in the fact that where the lay supporters suffer, the *pongyis* cannot look on askance. The claim for new rights and new privileges, the demands for political emancipation, were regarded as much a part of the *pongyis*' work as is the religious duty which they had hitherto performed. The whole countryside was filled with *pongyis* in the guise of political emissaries, speaking the political jargon of the day, preaching political precepts sometimes

without any religious covering. The sitting posture adopted when discoursing on religious topics gave place to the standing attitude which politicians are wont to strike for the better and more effective haranguing of the multitude. The general theme of the discourse was ' down with diarchy,' and few if any subjects lend themselves more to attacks of various kinds on those who could accept diarchy, on those who would confer diarchy. The language employed sometimes savoured more of the *zat-pwe* than of the *pongyi-kyaung*, and for a considerable period *pongyi* political propagandists were all the rage. But there came a time when the Burmese political camp split up, and while the more moderate section accepted the order of things as they are, the extreme section remained discontented, and with the latter element the *pongyis* made common cause. Later on the extremists, called in the newspaper jargon of the day ' Council Boycotters,' again divided into two camps, one of which down to this day remains distinctly and directly under the patronage of the *pongyis*.

Such, in brief, is the part the *pongyis* took in the present political life of the Province. For a considerable time past Burma's contact with the West had been lessening the hold of the clergy on the laity. No longer did the Burman with a modern education turn to the *pongyi* to solve problems that beset him—problems domestic or otherwise. No longer did the *pongyi* receive the recognition that was his, as the fountain head of all wisdom and knowledge. He had become an anachronism in the new social order. In villages and hamlets where the old-world reverence and the respect for the *pongyi* prevailed, the newspaper and the journal, the political pamphlet and the peripatetic politician, all combine

to make the villager feel that there are more things happening in the world than our *pongyi* can discourse upon. The *pongyi* certainly must have noticed this gradual waning of his influence and thus, perhaps, turned to politics to regain the priestly prestige, which was in imminent danger of slipping away from his hands.

But the *pongyi* as a politician cannot survive long. Strange as it may appear, the result of the *pongyi's* participation in politics was the reverse of what was anticipated. The laity, divided among themselves in regard to political views, came to discriminate as to the *pongyi* whom they should support in the way of food and raiment, while some, and they are not a few, broke off all connexions with *pongyis* having anything to do with politics. To confine the *pongyi* within the cloister and to chain him down to what is rightly his duty—the practice of religion—is the move of the present day. Thus, politics of the day influences Buddhism to the extent of creating a desire on the part of its adherents to keep it intact from outside influences. A time there was when the faults of *pongyis*, if there be any, were conveyed with bated breath and in hushed whispers. It is no longer so now. Their faults are condemned and noted and proclaimed in the public press. The unseemly sight of *pongyis* frequenting public places of amusement, the un-*pongyi*-like action of some *pongyis*, often form the subject of bitter attack in the vernacular papers. The cry is now for the purification of the priesthood, to rid the *sangha* of undesirables parading under the pseudonym of *pongyis*, and using the convenient yellow robe wherein to beguile the unwary public. The feeling is, if I may so put it, ' All are not *pongyis*, clad though they

be in yellow.' In passing, mention might be made of the controversy in the vernacular press regarding the study of English by *pongyis*. While one section upholds the need of modernizing the *pongyi*, another maintains that the study of English might make the *pongyi* the less a *pongyi*. The controversy has not concluded, but it is apparent that there is a feeling of the need of bringing the religion abreast of modern conditions.

The modern educated young Burman has degenerated in the opinion of some into an irreligious breed. The exigencies of the modern educational system converted the customary novitiate in a *kyaung* into an empty formal ritual. It is not long enough either to equip him or give him the necessary training which the Burman Buddhist venturing out on life's voyage should have. In the Government schools religious instruction forms no part of the curriculum ; in the mission schools the doctrines of an alien faith are instilled in the minds of the pupils. And so schools which seek to teach the national faith are countenanced and the demand everywhere for religious instruction has become insistent. True it is that the educated Burman's belief in his religion is not the same simple faith as professed by his co-religionists in the villages, but the same principles guide their worship.

The question has been asked as to the tendencies of Burmese Buddhism due to western science and rationalism. Modern science, so the Burman Buddhist thinks, tends to support the religion he professes, for there is nothing in it that runs counter to his belief. Buddhism is for all times and for all climes —it suited the days when kings made royal progresses on elephants ; it is in keeping with the times when aeroplanes fly in the air and television is coming.

Christianity, according to the Buddhist, is crumbling with the advance of modern science and the creation dogma, amongst others as propounded in the Bible, can no longer stand the test of science. As regards rationalism, it is not easy to speak. The works of the Rationalist Press Association find ready readers among Burman Buddhists. Such books as Grant Allen's *The Evolution of the Idea of God*, Ingersoll's *Lectures and Essays*, Thomas Paine's *The Age of Reason*, may be quoted as forming the bulk of the works that Burmans browse over. How far rationalism has influenced Buddhism it is impossible to determine, but yet there can be no gainsaying the fact that the modern Buddhist is backed up in his belief by a touch of rationalism. Then again the works of such men as William T. Stead, Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir A. Conan Doyle on matters psychic do influence the English educated Burman Buddhist of to-day. In these he finds something to strengthen his belief in a state spiritual, and the Animist within the Burman is delighted.

The impact of Christianity upon the Burmese Buddhist world must of necessity leave some traces on the latter. Organized charity, such as that of the Home for the Aged at Mingun, the desire expressed more than once, but as yet unfulfilled, of sending out Buddhist missionaries to the slaves recently freed in the Triangle, the publication of works on Buddhism written in the popular style, the translation of the *Tripatakas* into Burmese—all these and many other things besides can be said to have their parallel in the days of King Asoka. But here the impact with Christianity is clearly visible, though the Burman Buddhist would rather be inclined to hold that it is western influence. People are less intolerant of the

Christian nowadays, and a Karen Christian member of the Legislative Council was reported to have remarked of a certain party in the Legislative Council composed solely of Buddhists, that it had done nothing to hurt the feelings or injure the interests of the Christians. The two religions are not antagonistic in the main and when a religion can rise above narrow sectarianism, it is possible to meet others without coming into conflict.

The decade which I have taken for the purpose of this paper is about to die out, and summing up the tendency of Burmese Buddhism during that period one word alone will, I think, suffice—transition. Everything is in a period of flux. The political movement is so inextricably bound up with the religious movement, new thoughts and fresh ideas and the outcome of the post-war world are so unsettling men's minds, that it is impossible to say whither Burmese Buddhism is tending. The awakening of national consciousness, and along with it the intensive desire to preserve national literature, national traits, national customs, arrested for the time being what might have been the disintegration of national religion due to influences beyond the Burman's control. With the priests and laymen apart, with cultures remote and distant, with outlooks different, with ideas irreconcilable, there had been signs of the rise of a newer Buddhism, untrammelled by time-worn prejudices, unhampered by archaic theories, finding support from the latest thoughts, the latest discoveries the world has to offer. The conservative movement, however, prevented that rise, and with the wider diffusion of modern knowledge among the people Buddhism wil still remain the predominant religion of the Burman

CHRISTIANITY AND NORTHERN BUDDHISM

The Rev. A. K. Reischauer, D.D.

I. THE RELIGION OF SAKYAMUNI

WHAT was the essence of the religion of Sakyamuni? What were the chief insights which he gained into the meaning and purpose of life, and how did he live his life among his fellow-men?

If Christians down through the centuries have differed widely as to Jesus Christ and the essentials of His message, it should not seem strange that Buddhists have differed even more about Sakyamuni and his teachings. After all, the problem confronting the Christian scholar is comparatively simple. In the New Testament we have the chief source book on the beginnings of Christianity. When we ask what is the chief source book for the beginnings of Buddhism, Buddhists themselves would differ radically. To most scholars it may seem clear that in the Pali Canon we have, on the whole, the best source material and that some of this is found also in the voluminous northern canons, but millions of northern Buddhists regard certain scriptures in the northern canons as the quintessence of Buddhist teachings even though these scriptures have no parallels in the Pali Canon and even though it is clear that they did not come into existence until four or five hundred years after Sakyamuni's time.

Even if one confines one's self to the comparatively small Pali Canon and those portions of the northern canons which are in substantial agreement with the Pali Canon, one is still much in the dark as to the founder of Buddhism and the essentials of his teachings. First-rate scholars differ widely about this great and puzzling Indian personality and about his chief insights into life's meaning and purpose.

There are those who picture Sakyamuni as the world's great rationalist who by a process of keen analysis laid bare before the unbiased mind the ultimate elements of existence, especially the elements that make up our human personality. Modern Japanese Buddhists glory in this and contend that the Buddha's teachings are in full agreement with the latest achievements of modern science. There is much in Sakyamuni's teachings about the nature of the self, at least the empirical ego, which does remind one strongly of the teachings of rationalistic philosophers in the West and of the conceptions which some modern psychologists advance. The self as a ' mere stream of consciousness,' ever flowing and ever changing, with nothing constant about it but the law of change, reminds one of the early Greek Atomists and of some of our modern scientists. His insistence on the inexorable working of the causal nexus in human life lends special colour to this picture of Sakyamuni as a rationalist or as a scientist. But while there are these aspects of his teachings, nothing could be further from the truth than to think of the Buddha chiefly as a rationalist or a man interested in human life in the way in which the modern scientist is interested.

There are other scholars who say that while Sakyamuni may have been a sort of rationalist, this was

but a preliminary step by which to rise above all human thought and that in reality he was the world's first great mystic. By his psychological analysis he destroyed man's illusions about the empirical ego in order to clear the ground for contemplation and ecstatic vision through which ultimate reality, which transcends all thought, might appear. If one regards the Buddha's experience at the moment of his enlightenment under the Bodhi-tree as central in his teaching, then one must agree that he was above all else a mystic, one to whom ultimate reality was so totally different from reality as the average man experiences it from day to day in his ordinary sense life, that it could be spoken of only in terms of negation, if spoken of at all. Such insight is the Nirvana state and Nirvana is the great 'Void.' It is an 'Emptiness' when compared with all that fills the life of the ordinary man.

Now after one has called the Buddha a mystic one may know certain things about him and his central teachings, but not much. There still remain the big problems as to the content of his mystical insight and as to how he related this insight to the experiences of his daily life during his long ministry of fifty years.

The trouble about the content of the mystic's insight is that it is usually too much like Schelling's Absolute which, as Hegel said, is 'the night in which all cows are black.' And about Sakyamuni's mystical insight we do not know whether in his 'Night' there were 'red, white, and coloured cows that looked black or whether there were no cows at all.' It seems fairly certain that to him in that hour of ecstatic vision the whole realm of our sense life and all consciousness of the empirical ego fell away as if

it had no existence whatever; but what is not clear is the question as to whether there was the consciousness of a higher self or not. Was his Nirvana an absolute Void or only a void when measured by our ordinary experience? In his psychology he clearly taught that the empirical ego is but a flux of consciousness and that it has no existence beyond this flux; but did he hold, or did he not hold, that there is a 'true self' which appears when all that which fills the consciousness of the empirical ego has been cleared away? Most modern Buddhists, especially the Buddhists of China and Japan, would say that Sakyamuni did believe in the existence of the higher self, and that the Nirvana state is void only of such things as make up the life of the empirical ego, but that it is in reality a great 'Fulness.' I doubt, however, whether this view can be scientifically established from the oldest and most reliable records of the Buddha's teachings, though it is true that the Buddhist mystics of China and Japan have usually put a positive content into their conception of the Nirvana state.

The truth of the matter seems to be that there are really two fundamentally different types of mysticism, namely, impersonal mysticism and personal mysticism. Impersonal mysticism lends itself to a great variety of interpretations, ranging all the way from a mere negation of all that one experiences in the ordinary 'stream of consciousness' to a sort of intoxication in which everything is retained but in which the differences between things disappear. In this latter case ultimate reality is not a void but a fulness and this fulness is a 'Sameness' that lies 'beyond good and evil,' yea, 'beyond being and non-being.'

Personal mysticism, on the other hand, however much it may regard the ordinary stream of consciousness as a shallow grasp of reality, nevertheless does retain some aspects of this stream of consciousness —usually our moral relations and ethical love—as being in some way a partial grasp of ultimate reality.

Now if we call Sakyamuni a mystic we must think of his mysticism as of the impersonal type. Where in the long scale of impersonal mysticism he is to be placed must be left unanswered for the present. Whether ultimate reality as apprehended by the enlightened one is but a void so that insight into truth is nothing positive whatever but simply a 'breaking of error and illusion,' as one school in Buddhism has maintained, or whether it is an inclusion of everything but a blotting out of all distinctions, 'the *dharma* of non-duality,' 'the identity of differences,' 'the indifference of opposites,' 'the beyond good and evil,' 'the beyond being and non-being,' as other Buddhists have maintained, must be left to others to decide. What is clear is that in this type of mysticism the concept of personality and all the higher values of our personal life such as the ethical, virtually disappear. If they do not disappear they are reduced to the level of the impersonal, for all distinctions which we experience in our ordinary life have no real meaning from this standpoint.

Probably we can understand Sakyamuni's impersonal mysticism best by seeing how he related it to his practical daily life. After all, this is of primary importance in determining the real value of his life and teachings for human life.

We get at this best by seeing first what was Sakyamuni's estimate of human life as this is lived by the

ordinary man. This estimate is stated most succinctly in the Sermon of Benares, especially in the so-called ' Four Noble Truths.'

It cannot be doubted that Sakyamuni was convinced from his own experience that human life, even for the fortunate, is essentially an existence of evil. It is an existence in which sorrow and suffering outweigh the good. In fact the good helps only to emphasize the evil, for it soon comes to an end and so makes suffering the more poignant. This is the meaning of the first of the ' Four Noble Truths.'

The natural question that arises is, Why is human life primarily an existence of sorrow and suffering, and is it necessarily so ? The answer is that the cause lies not in the circumstances of life, which might gradually be altered, but rather in the very nature of individual existence, in our very desire for life. We long for things but this very longing is a curse, for it can never be satisfied. To try to satisfy our desires only results in increasing our thirst. It is therefore our desire for life which is the cause of life's sorrows and suffering.

What then is the way out of this situation ? There is a way out. It is the suppression of all desires.

Does this mean simply that we should suppress our lower passions and that by an ascetic attitude towards these we clear the way for noble desires that might be legitimately gratified and fulfilled ? If that is what the Buddha meant, as some moderns claim, then his teaching was nothing new in India, for that is what most of the holy men of his time were saying. That is the view he himself held for six years when he was seeking a way out, but he rejected this way. He rejected the ascetic's solution because he

elt that the ascetic by his very asceticism magnified the things that he would eschew since he treated them as real and as enemies worthy of his best steel. And the ascetic in his hope for a better life beyond this life filled that better life with a content taken from the brighter side of our present life. But that is futile, for this life, even the brighter aspect of it, is hopelessly evil and an illusion. The only way in which man can escape from this evil existence is to give up all desires for any phase of it, even the desire for a better future life. To know that life is a meaningless vacuity is to gain the strength to renounce it, to obtain release. 'Unwisely does one consider, "Have I existed in ages past? . . . Shall I exist in ages to be, do I exist at all, am I, how am I? This is a being, whence is it come, whither will it go?" Considerations such as these are walking in the jungle of delusions. These are the things one should consider: "This is suffering, this is the origin of suffering, this is the cessation of suffering, this is the way that leads to the cessation of suffering." From him that considers thus his fetters fall away.'

This was the first and primary interest of the Buddha—to show the vacuity of life as we live it and the impossibility of conceiving of a life that is worth living even though it were made up of the better and higher aspects of our present life. That is what constitutes true enlightenment, to know that all individual existence is inherently an existence of suffering, and therefore to give up all desire for life, even the desire for a better life.

Now, granted that Sakyamuni held that human life is inherently evil and meaningless and that the highest good for every individual being is to escape from it; and granted further that he held that all

desires for a better life beyond death are but a fetter that binds one to this incurably evil life, since we cannot think at all about a better life except in terms of the good things we experience now ; does it follow that to Sakyamuni Nirvana or Pari Nirvana was an absolute cessation of all being, or was it only a cessation of being as we at present experience being ?

This brings us back to the question as to whether the Buddha was a sort of rationalist who by a process of psychological analysis discovered that the self was but a stream of consciousness and had no further existence when at death the elements of individuality, the Five *Skandhas*, fell apart, or whether he was a mystic who used this process of analysis merely to get rid of the empirical ego so as to rise into the true reality which is beyond all human language to describe.

It is rather plain that he regarded the self, at least the empirical ego, as being but a sort of composite made up of the Five *Skandhas* and that mysterious *karma* energy, or ' will to be,' and that at death the Five *Skandhas* fall apart so that the life of that particular individual comes to an end. But this is not saying that he therefore held some such view as the old Greek Atomists or the modern materialists to whom the self is but a name for the psychic flux and which has no existence except in this flux, since at bottom it is only a sort of epiphenomenon of the physical. While he taught definitely that the self of which we are conscious in our ordinary psychic life has no further existence than in this ' stream of consciousness ' and that this ends at death, he nevertheless held that more than the physical elements were left, for he held that *karma* persists beyond death and that this *karma* has ethical qualities and

rebuilds an individual which, though a different individual from the old one, nevertheless perpetuates the moral qualities of the old individual. A kind of self, therefore, does live on in the successive stages of the *karma* chain and so creates a better, or worse, individual than the previous one.

But what happens when finally the *karma* energy is exhausted, as some day it may be exhausted, according to the Buddha's teaching? As long as *karma*, 'the will to be,' is unenlightened, i.e. a 'blind will to be,' it will go on in endless cycles of individual existence, for it is a desire for life, and therefore as long as the desire persists so long the long chain of successive individual beings will ensue. But when this 'blind will to be' gradually becomes enlightened so that it sees the vacuity of life, it will then cease to 'will to be' and the *karma* will cease building up individuals after individuals. That is the meaning of that famous text which reads, 'Looking for the maker (*karma*) of this tabernacle I shall have to run through a course of many births, so long as I do not find; and painful is birth again and again. But now, maker of the tabernacle, thou hast been seen; thou shalt not make up this tabernacle again. All thy rafters are broken, thy ridge pole is sundered, thy mind approaching Nirvana has attained the extinction of all desires.'

What happens then? Does this chain of individuals, differing from one another so that they are not identical and yet bound together by the *karma* chain, finally end in zero, or in what? Does enlightenment, which brings release from this evil human life, end the whole process, or does it lead to something better which is more than 'the good of an escape from evil'?

Here is the Buddha's reply to such questions. 'As a flame blown out by the wind goes out and cannot be reckoned as existing; so a sage delivered from name and body disappears and cannot be reckoned as existing.'

'But has he only disappeared, or does he not exist, or is he only free from sickness?' ask the disciples. The Buddha replies, 'For him there is no form, and that by which they say he is, exists for him no longer.'

Whether this means absolute zero or simply what a radical mystic might hold, an existence so totally different from all we experience in life that it can only be called non-existence, cannot be answered positively. What can be stated positively is that Sakyamuni regarded human life as being so fundamentally evil and meaningless that it becomes the first business of the wise man to get out of it and to help others to get out of it, whether beyond this release from evil there is a positive good that we might enter or not.

I realize that it will be hard for the average westerner with his love of life, and especially the western Christian who persists in finding real meaning and value in human life, to accept this estimate of life as in any way worthy of such a good and great personality as Sakyamuni, whose followers are numbered by the hundreds of millions. It will be asked: How could a man who placed such a low estimate on human life, and who had so little or nothing to say about a better life, have won such a great following?

As a matter of fact, as we shall see later, the vast majority of the Buddha's followers never followed him in these central points of his teachings. This

is one answer. Another answer is that while from a Christian standpoint the Buddha's estimate of life is unworthy, we must remember that we are not here moving in a Christian atmosphere, and especially not in the atmosphere of Jesus Christ who looked upon this world as the Heavenly Father's world and who looked upon all human beings as potential children of God. We shall understand the Buddha's estimate of life and his conception of human destiny if we leave God out of the picture, for that is what he did. One can talk of the essentials of Sakyamuni's teachings without a thought of God, the Heavenly Father, though this would be absolutely impossible when it comes to the essentials of the teachings of Jesus Christ. In passing, let us say that in this very fact we have one of the tremendous differences between Sakyamuni and Jesus.

But is Sakyamuni's estimate of human life so wholly foreign to the western mind that it need puzzle us greatly ?

Since the days of Heraclitus and Epicurus there have been in the West those who saw no ultimate meaning and value in human life. In fact, there are to-day only too many who would subscribe to the creed of a recent atheistic league in America which says, ' Life is entirely without meaning except to the individual himself.' That is, life has no meaning except what the individual gets out of it from moment to moment as he lives it now, with the implication that death ends all such meanings for the individual since he himself ceases to be. And because life has no larger meaning, they reason as materialists have usually reasoned, ' Let us get the most out of life while it lasts.' ' Eat, drink and be merry for to-morrow we die.'

On the other hand innumerable people in the West have held that our present life is incurably evil and not worth living if it were not for the fact that it does lead to a better life beyond the grave. Even Christians have often looked upon this world as the devil's world even though the first article of the oldest and most frequently repeated Christian creed says that we as Christians ' believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.'

So there have been in the West those who say that life has no ultimate meaning or goal and those who say that our present life is an incurable evil and not worth living. Now if we combined these two into one view we should have a conception akin to the Buddha's conception. The life of the mere worldling Sakyamuni found to be empty and meaningless. He knew that from his own experience. The hope for a better life here and beyond he apparently did not have, for Sakyamuni apparently was without any faith in God. What then was left that he could do, noble soul and sympathetic personality that he was ? The one thing that was left was to find a way by which to end this meaningless suffering. He who has suffered will regard the cessation of suffering as a positive joy. And if such a one is a sympathetic personality as he was, then the discovery of a way to escape from suffering, not only for himself but also for fellow-sufferers, will be a real satisfaction and will give a man a worthy motive for which to live. It would not be a Christian motive but it would be a noble motive just the same. Sakyamuni was too fine to live the coarse life of the sensualist who would hush the nobler aspirations for life by sinking himself in a daily round of pleasures as long as desire lasts. He wanted to bring this to

an end, and he was willing to stand by his fellow-man till he, too, could escape. Probably no lines in western literature more nearly express the Buddha's attitude towards life than those lines in Matthew Arnold's *Dover Beach* :

> Ah, love, let us be true
> To one another ! for the world which seems
> To lie before us like a land of dreams,
> So various, so beautiful, so new,
> Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
> Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain ;
> And we are here as on a darkling plain
> Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
> Where ignorant armies clash by night.

That was the Buddha's estimate of human life and that is all the hope he had for it except the hope of bringing this blind struggle and suffering to an end.

But some one will say : Granted that this was his estimate of life and that his gospel was only a gospel of release, is it not true that he spent his long ministry of fifty years in teaching the people of India to control their lower passions and to live in a brotherly manner towards one another, and should we not judge him by this and make this the heart of his gospel, as the Sermon on the Mount represents Jesus' teaching as to the true way of life ?

That is true in a way and we must always see this aspect of the Buddha's life and teachings if we would get the full picture of him. In fact, if one centres one's attention on this aspect one feels very near the Buddha, for few men have shown deeper sympathy and greater kindness towards their fellow-men than Sakyamuni showed. Many of his ethical teachings are on a high plane and can be accepted as salutary by all morally-minded men. Especially is this true

of his influence over men in weaning them from the lure of the lower passions and teaching them how to find greater satisfaction in a life of sympathy and kindliness. His moral earnestness was beyond question. That is one of the great assets for Buddhists even to-day. They can always refer to the founder as a man of sincerity, deep sympathy and a certain nobility of soul. Few men have ever been more emphatic in teaching that the way of the passions is enslavement and that the ' wages of sin is death.'

But after we have said this we must not conceal the fact that the Buddha's ethical teachings were, after all, flavoured by his estimate of human life and by his insight into life's ultimate meaning and values. Here we come to one of the real difficulties in Buddhism, one which has not only puzzled the outsider but which has also worked endless confusion within Buddhism itself. It is the seeming, if not actual, contradiction between the Buddha's ethical teachings and his teachings as to the real goal of salvation.

The goal of salvation, as we saw, was primarily the release from this evil life, and even if there is an existence for the enlightened one beyond this life such an existence must be regarded as utterly devoid of everything we experience in our present life. Now, as long as ethical conduct concerns itself with simply breaking the fetters which bind man to this life, the goal of such conduct is in substantial agreement with the goal of salvation. Such an ethic is essentially a matter of negations, and the prevailing ethical emphasis in early Buddhism was of that character. The highest achievement is, as it is stated with endless repetition in the *Dhammapada*, to train a man to ' wander alone like a rhinoceros,'

i.e. to cut one's self off from normal life and be independent of others. And the chief virtue in the individual's life towards others is the virtue which grows out of a life-denying attitude, namely, compassion for fellow-sufferers. The German is here more expressive : '*Das Leben ist Leiden und darum ist die höchste Tugend Mitleid.*'[1] Non-injury to others becomes characteristic. This rises to the virtue of gentleness and even kindliness, but hardly to the level of real love, for love seeks for its object not merely to protect from harm but also to bestow a positive good. Love puts too much emphasis on permanent values and meanings ; it regards the human personality as too sacred to be a real characteristic virtue of Sakyamuni's ethical teachings, though few men have ever shown a deeper sympathy for fellow-sufferers than he showed.

But while the prevailing emphasis in Buddhist ethics is on virtues which enable a man to cut himself loose from this life, or on virtues towards others which grow out of a life-denying—rather than a life-affirming—attitude, the effect was after all the building up of a noble personality, as if this were regarded as of permanent value. In fact, many Buddhists claim that the real goal of the Buddha's ethical teachings was the achievement of an ethical personality as the thing of supreme value in life. But if that was the goal of his ethical teachings, how can this goal be reconciled with the goal of salvation which is usually represented as being devoid of all the content of our present life, even the ethical ? The truth seems to be that we have here a real contradiction in the Buddha's teachings on matters which from our Christian standpoint would be re-

[1] Life is suffering and therefore the highest virtue is compassion.

garded as fundamentals. In his ethical teachings he seems to emphasize the achievement of an ethical personality as the highest goal, but in his teachings as to the highest enlightenment and the Nirvana state he seems to say that personality and even the elements of an ethical personality have no place since this is devoid of all that we experience in this present life. This contradiction can be explained only on the ground that the Buddha regarded the ethical in human life as representing only the last stage of the way that leads out from this world of suffering and illusion, but not as in any way representing the nature of ultimate reality. Our moral intuitions, according to the Buddha, are not, as Kant said, our deepest insight into the nature of ultimate reality but only our best guide on the road that leads away from evil. Through ethical conduct we achieve a noble character in order to bring to an end all that makes up good or evil characters.

If the Buddha did not reduce the ethical to a mere device by which we escape from this evil world, and if he held that such achievements have permanent value, then he must have believed in the existence of a higher self. But if he believed in such a higher self, then why did he not say so in language that could not be doubted? I do not say that he absolutely denied the continuance of a truer self that would conserve the achievements of an ethical personality, but I do say that he was not positive in affirming this. The best that can be said is that he put this question among the so-called great indeterminate things, neither affirming nor denying them.

As was stated above, if the Buddha is regarded as a mystic his mysticism is impersonal mysticism which does not affirm anything about ultimate

reality which we experience as personal beings, not even what we experience in our moral intuitions. This fact must ever give his ethical teachings a different flavour and emphasis from Christian ethics, for in Christianity we insist that in the ethical we have our deepest insight into ultimate reality 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.' Often we are tempted to compare Sakyamuni with our Christian mystics, and perhaps it is true that in these mystics Buddhism and Christianity come nearest each other, but we must always remember that, while Christian mystics have talked about the *via negativa* and used expressions which sound like the Void of Buddhism, they nevertheless regarded their ethical life and their moral insight as representing at least a partial grasp on ultimate reality and not as a mere means by which to escape from the present evil world. And if one takes the mysticism of Paul and the New Testament writers as the real Christian type of mysticism then it is even clearer that ethical personality is not the mere means of an escape but the real goal of life.

The real reason for this fundamental difference between Sakyamuni's ethical goal and the ethical goal in Christianity is just this, that in Christianity everything groups itself around the one great centre, namely, God, the Eternal and Perfect Personality, while in Sakyamuni's teachings there is little or nothing about God. To be sure, Sakyamuni believed in the existence of beings higher than man as he believed in the existence of beings lower than man such as animals, but these higher beings were like man bound to the 'wheel of life' until they achieved their release through insight into life's vacuity. The highest reality in Sakyamuni's thought is the

impersonal moral Law, not a personal moral Being. There is practically nothing in his teachings which corresponds even remotely to what is so central in the teachings of Jesus Christ, namely, the Living God, the Heavenly Father.

And because there is no supreme, perfect Personality at the heart of things, it is not strange that the founder of Buddhism was hesitant in affirming that human personality has permanent meaning and value, however much in his ethical teachings he may have stressed the importance of achieving an ethical personality. These two conceptions—a supreme, perfect personality at the centre of things, and the achievement of an ethical personality as the highest, positive goal of human life—usually go together. It is next to impossible to hold consistently and positively to one without holding also to the other. We may not be certain that the Buddha denied both, but we can be certain that he was not very positive in affirming his belief in either. Let those who so glibly say that all religions are virtually the same in their essentials face this fact that the Buddha had little or nothing to say about God, the Heavenly Father, and that Jesus Christ had little or nothing to say which did not make God central. However much these two had in common and however much Buddhism and Christianity in their historical developments approached each other, it is arrant nonsense to say that Sakyamuni and Jesus Christ saw the big things of human life in substantially the same way. In their estimate of human life as it is, in their conception of what life might become here and of its ultimate goal, and, above all, in their inner consciousness of what is at the centre of all reality they differed, and differed radically.

And now let us take a glance at the question of Sakyamuni's influence on life in general, on Indian culture and civilization. Granted that he held these views about ultimate reality and the destiny of the individual human personality, what was his influence on practical life ? If this influence was on the whole good and ennobling, may we not look to him even now for inspiration and help in our modern world ?

These are questions which present-day Christian workers in the Orient must consider seriously, for since the days of the World War there has been a growing feeling that Christianity, possibly because of its insistence on the rights of the individual and the value of the human personality, inculcates characteristics which lead to self-assertion and to aggression in national life, which is the root of all wars, while the Buddha's life-denying ideal and emphasis on the milder virtues works towards the pacifist ideal and so is more favourable for a higher civilization.

In the long run a given culture or civilization is determined by the character of the individuals that make up the people in any given cultural sphere. This does not, however, hinder a limited group from following a certain type of life which might secure for that limited group what they want of life but which, if followed by all, might have very different results. It should be plain that if the Buddha had really succeeded in persuading the people of India as a whole to accept his estimate of life and to act upon that estimate as a limited group did, Indian life and culture would naturally have come to an end in a generation or two. If life is an incurable evil, it follows that the monastic ideal is the highest ideal. The monk, if he is true to his ideal, does not propagate

the human species and so prolong the meaningless process. And if all accepted this ideal there would soon be no human species to produce monks. That is the consummation to be desired from the standpoint of the Buddha's fundamental position in regard to human life, and the only reason why that was not the consummation of Indian history is because only a limited number of Indians accepted seriously Sakyamuni's estimate of life. The Buddha knew human nature too well to expect any but a smaller group to follow him to the limit. In fact, as tradition has it, the great temptation he had to face after his enlightenment was just this temptation of not trying to communicate his Gospel of Release to others. He knew that few, if any, would understand him, or be willing to give up their desire for life even if they understood. Here is where Sakyamuni showed himself as a man of deep insight into human nature and a man of so-called practical common sense. He was willing to try even though few would follow. That is why at the beginning he organized his followers into the two great divisions of monks and laymen, setting for the former a higher goal than for the latter, with the hope, of course, that the latter would gradually move forward to the ideal of the former, either in old age when the desires of life are weaker or in another incarnation. It should also be added that while this was a ' practical ' adjustment of his teachings to fit the conditions he had to face, it was really a fatal compromise between what he regarded as the highest ideal and lower ideals, the first of those ' practical ' compromises which have been so characteristic of Buddhism down through the centuries and so fatal to the acceptance of the Buddha's real teachings. Of course, the Buddha's

first great compromise was nearer the truth about human life, as we Christians see life, than what he himself regarded as the higher truth. That is, the Buddhist layman who was taught to control his lower passions and live a life of kindly deeds towards others seemed nearer a worthy ideal of life than the monk who cut himself loose from normal life so that he might gain release. In any case, it was because of the Buddha's compromise that his religious ideals had a chance to influence Indian history at all.

There can be no question that the Buddha exerted an ennobling influence on Indian civilization especially through his influence on laymen who just because they did not go the whole way of the monk but maintained a place 'in the world' gradually spread the ideal of self-control, gentleness, and kindly sympathy throughout Indian society. If the layman accepted the monk ideal only in his old age, as it frequently happened, it did not interfere with the development of human society. By that time he had already done his share in perpetuating the race and made his contribution to at least the externals of civilization. In fact, just because he had not 'forsaken the world' earlier, he had something with which to fill the begging bowl of the monk, and by giving alms to these 'holy men' he was encouraged to believe that he was taking at least the first steps on the long road which led out from this 'vale of tears.' As long as the proportion of begging monks was not too large, the Buddha's influence was on the whole good on society, and during his lifetime that situation prevailed. But one wonders whether he ever visualized to himself the condition of a society in which the begging bowls far outnumber the laymen who fill them with their alms. Where such

conditions have prevailed in Buddhist lands the status of civilization has little in it to commend it to those who want anything that could be called civilization.

One can say without fear of contradiction that Sakyamuni's influence on Indian civilization was one which meliorates and softens life, but not exactly an influence which intensifies or really heightens life as a whole. With right can it be said that his religion subdues passions and creates an atmosphere of general pacifism, but it must also be admitted that this toning down of the desires of life often left life poor and cheap. All the ennobling influence of his teachings on southern and eastern Asia has not prevented the 'poverty of the millions' and the cheapening and coarsening of life for the great masses.

Though Sakyamuni must be ranked high among the world's noble men, his Gospel of Release is not an adequate gospel; for deeper than suffering and deeper than our need to obtain release from suffering is our desire for life and our desire for a more abundant life. It may seem strange, but nearer the Christian conception in this respect than was Sakyamuni is the anti-Christian Nietzsche when he says:

> Die Welt ist tief,
> Und tiefer als der Tag gedacht.
> Tief ist ihr Weh—
> Lust—tiefer noch als Herzeleid:
> Weh spricht: Vergeh,
> Doch alle Lust will Ewigkeit—
> Will tiefe, tiefe Ewigkeit.[1]

[1] The world is deep,
And deeper deemed than is the day.
Deep is its woe—
Desire—deeper yet than heartbreak:
Woe says, Begone,
Yet all desire yearns for eternity—
Yearns for deep, deep eternity.

II. MODIFICATIONS IN THE ESSENTIALS OF SAKYAMUNI'S TEACHINGS

If it is true that Christianity in its historical development has frequently differed rather widely from the religion of the New Testament, Buddhism in its evolution underwent radical changes even in the great essentials of religion. Just a few of the more important changes can be indicated in this brief statement.

The great division of Buddhism into *Hinayana* and *Mahayana*[1] in a measure indicates that Buddhists themselves have recognized the great changes that have taken place. Without going into the problem of the relationship of these two great divisions or in any way tracing the historical development in either branch, it will be sufficient to indicate a few chief characteristics of *Mahayana* Buddhism which differentiate it from the religion of Sakyamuni and which have vital bearings upon the relationship between the Christian message and the Buddhists of this type

The Emergence of the God-Idea

From a Christian standpoint, the most important change which took place in Buddhism soon after the death of Sakyamuni and which has characterized especially *Mahayana* Buddhism down through the centuries, is the appearance in one form or another of something equivalent to a real God-idea. It is one of the great ironies of history that he who had so little or nothing to say about God should soon

[1] *Hinayana* and *Mahayana*, i.e. 'Lesser Vehicle' and 'Greater Vehicle,' or Southern and Northern Buddhism.

after his death be worshipped by his followers as God, or as one who revealed in some way the Eternal Buddha, or Buddhas. Those scholars who say that original Buddhism was virtually atheistic are right, but to say that Buddhism down through the centuries has been atheistic is as far from the truth as it could be. As a matter of fact, there are few conceptions of the divine which men have held which have not been held by Buddhists. These conceptions range all the way from a crude animism and a variegated polytheism up through lofty monistic systems, in which latter the conception ranges all the way from what is essentially materialism through a vague pantheism to a semi (if not actual) theism. To be sure, the Buddhist philosopher regards all such conceptions as but accommodations to the ignorant mind and he is usually agnostic or takes refuge in vague abstractions which may satisfy the minds of the few but which leave the hearts of the many cold.

Now from the standpoint of Sakyamuni himself as well as that of the average Buddhist philosopher, ancient or modern, this reaching out after God in these ideas about the divine must be regarded as a departure from the truth. But in spite of what the Founder of Buddhism said or did not say and in spite of what the Buddhist philosopher says or does not say, this demand of the hearts of common Buddhists cannot be ignored. The heart of man, whether he calls himself Buddhist or Christian, demands fellowship with a personal God, and if the philosophers and theologians cannot give the common man a worthy conception of God, the common man will form his own conception, and usually an unworthy one.

The truth of the matter seems to be this: The human heart needs fellowship with a personal God

and the human mind as it matures needs to find a unitary ground of all existence. The question is whether these two insistent demands of human nature can be satisfactorily met in religion. Buddhist history is a long commentary on this problem. It is the story of innumerable attempts to reconcile these two demands, but with only partial success. As a rule there has been a wide chasm between the religious conceptions of the masses and the conceptions of the few philosophers, especially in regard to the nature of ultimate reality or the divine. The masses have always believed in personal gods, yea, gods all too human and created in man's own image. On the other hand, the philosophers have usually contented themselves with conceptions too vague to be really vital for the real needs of human life, and the best that can be said is that some of them are reverently agnostic towards the ultimate and thus leave at least some room for the God-idea which seems so essential to any living religion.

In the face of this situation among Buddhists the question for Christian workers is whether they have an adequate answer to this central question in religion. It must be obvious that nothing can meet the demands of the human heart and the enlightened human mind but some such conception of God as we have in an enlightened Christianity—a personal God whom we know best through the unique personality of Jesus Christ, but the mystery of whose being and working no man can fully fathom. The Christian must insist that in our conception of a perfect personality we have the most adequate conception of God, but the intelligent, modest Christian will always leave room for a reverent agnosticism which confesses that we know Him but in part. On

the one hand we must avoid that cocksureness which talks about God as if He were but one of us, that belittling of God which grows out of an ignorant emotionalism. On the other hand we must avoid that so-called ' enlarging conception of God ' which makes Him but a name for something that exists only in the mind of the philosopher, a God-idea that functions but that does not represent an actual, objective reality. We need a consciousness of the Living God whom we know best in fellowship through Jesus Christ and of whose power and wisdom we get enlarging conceptions as we know more and more about His wonderful universe through the knowledge which modern science is giving us.

Change in the Ethical Ideal

The second great change from original Buddhism which characterizes much of *Mahayana* Buddhism is the change in the goal of the ethical ideal. As was shown in the preceding section, Sakyamuni was exceedingly indefinite in his teachings as to whether the human personality in any form had permanent value, even though in his ethical teachings the achievement of an ethical personality was held up as the highest goal. We saw that this apparent contradiction could be reconciled only by regarding the ethical as but the last stage of the way that leads out from this evil world and not as an index of ultimate reality. Now in *Mahayana* Buddhism there seems to be a real place for the idea that personality is of supreme worth and that it has permanent value. In the *Bodhisattva* doctrine we have, virtually, the belief in the survival of the human personality beyond the death of the individual. The *Bodhisattva* is one

who through incarnation after incarnation gradually builds up a perfect personality. And when this has once been achieved, the *Bodhisattva*, though free from the bondages of this evil world, returns again and again to this world in order to help others. Sakyamuni himself is interpreted in terms of the *Bodhisattva* doctrine and his beautiful character is accounted for only on the ground that he had through countless incarnations struggled upward in the path of moral living until he achieved the beautiful personal character that he was when he appeared in India some twenty-five centuries ago.

As a matter of fact, in this *Bodhisattva* ideal of *Mahayana* Buddhism we have a whole series of changes from original Buddhism. It involves not only a real continuance of the human personality from one incarnation to another, but also a doctrine of grace and a real belief in personal immortality for all who in faith respond to the gracious work of the *Bodhisattva*. The conceptions and ideals which are associated with such ideal Buddhas as Amitabha and Vairochana, who entered Buddhahood only after they had done their loving work as *Bodhisattva*, are radically different from what one finds in the religion of Sakyamuni, and they are in many ways far nearer the Christian conceptions than they are to the central teachings of original Buddhism.

But it must be added that here again the average Buddhist philosopher would say that all these doctrines are mere accommodations to human ignorance. They are not exactly false but neither should they be regarded as really true. They are at best expedients through which the ignorant are led out of their ignorance into higher truth, which higher truth becomes less definite as it progresses, for every-

thing that is definite cannot be really true since ultimate reality transcends all definitions and ideas.

The Christian scholar must agree with the Buddhist philosopher that the great *Bodhisattvas* and ideal Buddhas of *Mahayana* Buddhism should not be taken too seriously, however much the ignorant masses believe in them as objectively real, for they are confessedly but creations of the pious imagination and have not a shred of historicity about them. The *Bodhisattva* who became the ideal Buddha Amitabha, for example, and who is supposed to have appeared again and again in this world in his upward struggle, is a mere creation of some Buddhist's imagination. Professor Takakusu, himself a Buddhist scholar, in a recent series of articles on the Eight Principles of Buddhism, says of Amitabha and Vairochana that they are ' nothing more or less than objective expressions of ideals possessed by the Buddha in his mind. In short both are idealized Buddhas,' though Professor Takakusu in this same series of articles under the heading, ' Elevation of Personal Character,' says, ' The elevation of personal character is the one and sole aim of Buddhism,' and ' Buddhism teaches us to raise ourselves from the stage of common mortals to that of superhuman personality of a *Bodhisattva* and even to that of absolute personality, or Buddhahood.'

One wonders as to what Professor Takakusu and *Mahayana* Buddhist scholars like him really believe on this point. Do they believe that personality, superhuman personality, absolute personality, is in any real sense objective or is it a mere ' objective expression of ideals ' possessed in some one's mind ? That Amitabha and Vairochana are but such personifications of ideals (not held by the Buddha, as Pro-

fessor Takakusu seems to say, but by some later Buddhist), and that the stories which tell of their attainment of Buddhahood have not a shred of historicity about them, is true; but this does not mean that human personality cannot survive death nor that there might not be an Absolute or Perfect Personality such as we in Christianity conceive God to be. The question is, Do *Mahayana* Buddhist philosophers believe in the existence of a perfect personality or do they not? Professor Takakusu says that Buddhism teaches us how we might 'raise ourselves from the stage of common mortals to that of superhuman personality' or even to 'that of absolute personality.' If that is really possible for man, then why should we not believe in the existence of a personal God, the Perfect Personality, a conception which Buddhist philosophers usually reject as being too human to be true of the centre of reality?

The truth about *Mahayana* Buddhists seems to be that they would like to believe in the permanent value of the human personality and in the existence of a Perfect Personality through whose help human beings might find their highest life, and that in a measure they do believe in these things, but that the old spirit of agnosticism of original Buddhism and of the Buddhist philosopher down through the centuries always undermines this belief and cuts the nerve of all ethical striving which sets the achievement of an ethical personality as the highest goal of human endeavour. They are in the condition we Christians would be in if we were without the historic personality of Jesus Christ, in fellowship with whom we can become absolutely certain that a beautiful personality is the highest value in life, and that at the heart of things is the Perfect Personality of God, the Heavenly

Father. Our supreme assurance that God, the Perfect Personality, is not a projection of ourselves or of an ideal within our own mind, comes through our fellowship with the historic Christ, to whom nothing was more real than the reality of the Heavenly Father. And this is our supreme message to *Mahayana* Buddhists who in their *Bodhisattva* ideal are reaching out for life eternal in fellowship with the living God, but who need the assurance which can come only through Jesus Christ that to this longing of the human heart there is a real response from the heart of God Himself.

Change in the Estimate of Human Life

A third main change from original Buddhism which characterizes much of *Mahayana* Buddhism, especially as this type of Buddhism developed in China, Korea and Japan, was the change in the estimate of the value and meaning of our present normal human life. This change is natural and without it Buddhism would never have secured a hold on the northern and eastern Asiatic peoples. The Indian estimate of life, and especially the pessimistic estimate of Sakyamuni, is radically different from the typical outlook on life which one finds among the Chinese and Japanese peoples. Probably no people have ever been more ' this-worldly ' in their emphasis than the Chinese. Confucianism, which is the chief expression of the Chinese spirit and whose ideal for life dominated China for upwards of two thousand years, is above all else a religion of human relationships—an attempt to show man how to live with his fellow-man so as to get the most out of life. Taoism is the gospel of the Natural Life, because the

natural life is inherently good. Though Confucianism and Taoism differ widely from each other in that one insisted on a careful regulation and control of life and the other on an unrestricted freedom and a naïve Rousseauan naturalism, they were in substantial agreement in the thought that our present human life is essentially good. Japanese have been less 'this-worldly' than the Chinese and probably more idealistic, but they too have always looked upon human life as essentially good and they have always pictured the superhuman world largely in terms of the things that fill this world. In fact, the gods of Shinto are nothing but personifications of the forces of nature and the idealizations of human beings. In short, it would be difficult to imagine a sharper contrast than the contrast between India and these northern and eastern Asiatic peoples. The contrast is far greater than that between the East and the West of which we hear so much in our day.

Now when Buddhism came to the Chinese people, with their strong love for the natural life, it had already made a big place within its own system for this 'love of life'; and in its development in China, Korea and Japan it accommodated itself still further to the demand of the 'natural man.' In fact, Buddhism accepted as its own practically everything which it found in the lives of these peoples. The Taoist naturalism, the Confucian Ethics of the Five Human Relationships, all the content of the lower local cults in the various parts of China, and that conglomeration of cults in Japan which did not even have a name until Buddhists called it Shinto, the Way of the Gods—all these religions with their joy in the natural life and all the varied content of Chinese and Japanese cultures, Buddhism accepted as its

own. In fact, Buddhism in China and Japan not only accepted the pre-Buddhistic estimate of human life, but in the popular doctrines of the Amitabha sects and in a less degree in all the sects, Buddhism actually carried over into the life beyond almost the entire content of our present life. Of course, there have been and still are Chinese and Japanese Buddhists who look upon human life in some such way as Sakyamuni did and who seek above all else the calm of quieted passions and release from the fetters that bind man to his blind struggle called human life; but the vast majority of Buddhists in these lands have always looked to religion for help in securing for them the things they want here and now to make life more comfortable and richer. And if it was anything beyond this then it was to be assured by religion that when this life comes to an end they may have a life like this one in the realms beyond. To make sure of this latter boon they were ever ready to give alms to begging monks or to pay rich fees to priests who by the practice of certain rites had more or less control over the good things in the world beyond.

If the religion of Sakyamuni is the norm by which to judge the Buddhism which has prevailed in China, Korea and Japan during the past thousand years or more, then one must seriously question whether this can be called Buddhism in any real sense, since even in the essentials of religion the characteristic emphasis in the latter is so radically different from that in the former.

There are, of course, a few influences which have been passed on from Sakyamuni to these numerous followers in northern and eastern Asia. There is something of the spirit of gentleness and kindliness

of the founder, something of his teachings about the inexorable working of the causal nexus applied to the moral life and, above all, there is in the minds of many the ideal of an unselfish life lived for the good of others which can be interpreted in varying ways to fit in with the changing conditions of life. But after one has made full allowance for the influence of Sakyamuni's ideals for human life, one must admit that the most vital factors in Chinese and Japanese Buddhism have come not from the founder of Buddhism but rather from the life and civilization of the Chinese and Japanese themselves. These forces have changed the religion of Sakyamuni far more than the religion of Sakyamuni has changed the religious conceptions and ideals of the Chinese and Japanese. Not only is that true of the religion of the masses in which practically nothing of Sakyamuni's influence manifests itself, but also of the religion of the more intelligent classes. Buddhist apologists explain this as a *development* and claim that this was present in germ in the teachings of the founder, but it is far more accurate to say that Sakyamuni's religion is merely one factor among many, and that Chinese and Japanese Buddhism is largely the expression of the religious spirit of these peoples rather than a form of an Indian religion whose founder was the Buddha Sakyamuni.

III. THE RELIGION OF PRESENT-DAY BUDDHISTS

Whatever Buddhism was in its beginnings and whatever radical changes it underwent in its march northward and eastward across Asia, the most important question for the Christian worker in

Buddhist lands is, after all, the question as to what religion means to the present-day Buddhist. In this section the discussion is confined almost entirely to Japanese Buddhists, though there is good reason to believe that what is true to-day of them is also true of Buddhists in Korea, China and other eastern lands.

That Buddhism still has a hold on Japan no one who has seen the numerous temples in cities, towns and villages can seriously doubt. Nor can it be doubted that Japanese Buddhism is the most intelligent and progressive form of Buddhism to be found anywhere in the modern world. Judged by the ordinary standards of strength, Buddhism in Japan is a religion to be reckoned with by those who would bring the Christian message to present-day Buddhists.

But while Buddhism still has a place in the lives of many Japanese, it is exceedingly difficult to determine just what that place is and just what present-day Buddhism really stands for. How much of its vitality is a real vitality springing from its own inner resources and how much of it is a mere surface activity caused primarily by forces without ? And of the real vitality, how much of this comes from the incorporation of non-Buddhist elements even though these flow now in nominal Buddhist channels ? Such questions cannot be answered very easily. The truth of the matter is that the entire Orient, and especially Japan, is being influenced so tremendously by western civilization and by our common world-culture that it is next to impossible to know what are the mainsprings of life in modern Japan and what are but the channels through which the new life is flowing. About one thing we can be

fairly certain and that is that present-day Japanese want life and all that makes life full and interesting. Whether the rich and varied life of our modern world will come through nominal Buddhist channels or whether it will come largely through other channels is not yet clear, but that it is here and will come in increasing volume no one can doubt who knows modern Japan. Apparently the same will become increasingly true of Korea, China and even the southern Asiatic peoples.

In thinking of present-day Japanese Buddhists, therefore, we should think of them not so much as adherents of a religious system which in the past, and especially in its beginnings, stood as a rule for a life-denying ideal, but we should think of them as men, women and children who are reaching out passionately for a better life; and this better life is conceived of largely in terms of things which modern science and our common world-culture are making possible. There are some Japanese who accept Sakyamuni's life-denying ideal as the highest or who, after disappointments in their quest for the things which modern life provides, turn to the old ideal which seeks release from the affairs of the world; but the vast majority of Buddhists with whom the Christian worker in Japan will have to deal are people who want of life very much what present-day Americans and Europeans want of life, and they want these things on terms of equality with Americans and Europeans. Here in a peculiar sense are the words of the poet true:

> Willst du die andern verstehen,
> Blick in dein eigenes Herz.[1]

[1] Wouldst thou understand others,
Look into thine own heart.

And what present-day Japanese Buddhists do not want for themselves as individuals, they want for their family, for their community and above all for their nation. Probably no motive is more powerful in modern Japan than the keen desire in the heart of every loyal Japanese to see his country rank among the first nations of the world. The heart of religion for most Japanese, whether they are Shintoists or Buddhists, is Patriotism. Anything that will help Japan forge ahead into the front ranks of the nations of the world will be accepted as the supreme gospel of life and anything that is recognized as a hindrance to the attainment of this goal will be rejected, unless such a rejection runs counter too seriously to the stronger passions of men and women as individual human beings. It is not too much to say that in the minds of Japanese statesmen religion is looked upon primarily as an instrument of state, and that with the general run of Japanese people no appeal that religion can make to-day is stronger than its claim to give national strength to a people that walk in its way. The Old Testament claim that 'righteousness exalteth a nation' is one which appeals to modern Japan. This is why at the close of the Meiji Era, the Era of Enlightened Rule, the statesmen of Japan chose as the name for the new era, the word *Taisho*, Great Righteousness. It is not that they had a passion for personal righteousness but because they felt very keenly that the strength of the nation depended upon the righteousness of its people, and from that time on they have been looking more and more to religion to bring this righteousness to the people.

Now the strongest hold which Buddhism has on present-day Japan is the fact that for thirteen

centuries it has been identified with the life of the nation. What commended Buddhism in the first place to the Japanese people was not the central teachings of its founder, nor even the central teachings of *Mahayana* Buddhism discussed in the preceding section, but the simple fact that Buddhist missionaries were the vehicle of the higher civilization of the continent. The elements in this higher civilization which made the strongest appeal to the Japanese back in the sixth and seventh centuries when Buddhism was first introduced were largely the externals of civilization, those things in which the Japanese people soon recognized their own inferiority to the Koreans and Chinese. The first great influence on Japanese life which went beyond these externals of civilization was in the realm of Japanese political life, namely, the reforms introduced by the famous Buddhist Prince, Shotoku Taishi, and later the great Taika Reforms. Not until the ninth century did the religious ideals of Buddhism seriously influence Japan, and not until the twelfth century did the Japanese contribute anything of real substance to the development of Buddhism.

The question which arises here is whether in present-day Japan, with the strong passion for the things which modern science supplies and with the keen desire in the hearts of all Japanese to see their nation rank among the first nations of the world, Buddhism can play the rôle that it played in the past, i.e. the rôle of being a transmitter of this new and rich life that is pouring into Japan from the outside and that is radically changing Japan. That Buddhism is not the creator of this new civilization is clear to any but the hopelessly biased, and that the content of what we call modern civilization, especially

that part of it which modern science supplies, could not come from the conception of life which Sakyamuni held, ought to be equally clear. But it may be questioned whether, in spite of that, Buddhism in Japan may not serve at least as a transmitter of this new life even though it is not the creator of it. At any rate it seems safe to say that unless Buddhism can serve in some such capacity it will not keep its hold on Japan very firmly, especially not on the progressive elements in Japanese society.

We gain insight into this problem best by an analysis of the situation within Buddhism itself. The truth of the matter is that there are tremendous differences among Japanese Buddhists. Reference is not made here to such historic differences as might be found between, say, the typical *Zen* Buddhist and the followers of Nichiren, or such differences as one finds between the Amidaists with their over-emphasis on salvation through the grace of Amida and the typical 'save-thyself' Buddhists, but to the great differences among Buddhists caused by the greater or lesser extent to which they have come under the influence of the new forces that are shaping modern Japan.

The following is a rough classification into which Japanese Buddhists may be divided on the basis of these differences, though it should be remembered that these groups could be subdivided almost indefinitely and that one group shades off into the others next to it.

The Masses

There is first of all that large group of Buddhists that may be called 'the ignorant masses.' Even

though Japan has a very high percentage of literacy and even though the modern educational system is reaching out into the remotest mountain villages, there is still a large section of Japanese society which, especially in religious matters, lives on a rather low plane. Popular Buddhism, the religious life which centres around the average Buddhist temple, and particularly around such famous temples as the Asakusa Kwannon in Tokyo or the Tennoji of Osaka, is largely a religion of ignorance and superstition. In fact, the more one appreciates Japanese civilization and the more one admires Japan for the wonderful progress that she has made in recent years, the more one is shocked at the type of religious life which centres around most of the Buddhist temples. As is well known, Buddhism in the past won its way often by making compromises with all the low forms of religion that it encountered and in Japan it came to easy terms with the crude beliefs and practices of Shinto, incorporating all the rubbish and gross superstitions in its capacious womb. This is why popular Buddhism to this day is on a rather low level and often a real obstacle to progress and true enlightenment. It is no wonder that all through the Meiji Era, which stood for education and enlightened rule, intelligent Japanese looked upon religion as being largely a matter of ignorance and superstition. They regarded it as something that might be suitable for old-fashioned grandmothers, or by reason of its fairy-tales fit for entertaining children, but hardly as a real power in the life of an intelligent modern man. Popular Buddhism is to blame for this impression, for that is what it was and still is. When we think of this aspect of present-day Japanese Buddhism we cannot think very highly of this

religion. It stands so largely for things that obstruct life rather than for forces which promote life, and however sympathetic the Christian worker should be towards individual Buddhists of this type, he cannot look to such Buddhism as a power with which he might co-operate to build up a better life in Japan.

Naturally Japan's educational system will gradually undermine this type of religion and destroy the crude ideas of life which such Buddhists still hold, but this will also result in making these millions indifferent to or sceptical of any religious interpretation of life unless they can be guided by an intelligent religious leadership. Such leadership can hardly be expected from the average *bonsan* (ordinary priest). The truth is that the vast majority of these priests are either ignorant themselves or deal with their adherents on the basis of the older superstitions and crude religious conceptions, defending such practices on the ground that the ignorant masses cannot understand any higher expressions of the religious life.

The Recluse

A second group of Buddhists is composed of those who have been little influenced by the forces of modern life but who as sincere seekers after truth have found in the higher aspects of Buddhism a real spiritual life of a high order. In some of the quiet retreats of Buddhism this type is found. Naturally this is a small group since it is difficult for a real seeker after truth in modern Japan not to come into contact with and be deeply influenced by the new life that is coming in now from without. In a way this type of Buddhist is the most interesting to the student of comparative religion, for to know what

insight into life's meaning and values such men have gained is exceedingly enlightening as to what are the essentials of religion and wherein consists the supreme insight which the Christian gains through Jesus Christ. Probably the average Christian worker would find it difficult to approach Buddhists of this type, but one with broad sympathies and a wide knowledge of the variety of religious experience could win such men to the fuller life that is in Christ Jesus.

The Liberal Buddhist

In the third place there is a large and growing group of Buddhists who have been greatly influenced by western civilization and our common world-culture but who are still loyal Buddhists even though in their whole outlook on life they differ widely from their fathers in the faith. To this group belong first of all the average intelligent Buddhist laymen. They are not particularly intelligent in religious matters but in matters which the modern educational system of Japan stresses. They retain their connexion with Buddhism because it is a part of their general inheritance to which as Japanese they are loyal. They are too intelligent and too modern to have any vital connexion with popular Buddhism spoken of above. They know that there is a higher aspect to Buddhism for which they have real respect even though they are usually quite ignorant of what that higher aspect is. They think of Buddhism as of everything else in the life of Japan, a something which gradually adjusts itself to the new conditions of life in the modern world. Buddhism has always been fluid and there is no reason why it cannot continue to be so in the future. Their leaders tell

them that fundamentally its philosophy is in perfect harmony with modern science and so they expect that somehow their religion can be harmonized with and perhaps vitalized by the new life that is pouring into Japan from the western world.

But the more important section of this type of Buddhists are the actual leaders of thought, i.e. those intelligent Buddhists who have been greatly influenced by the new world and who are trying to work out a real synthesis of the new and the old. And these leaders may be subdivided into two main types, namely, those who are trying to assimilate the new to the old, and those who, glorying in the fact that Buddhism has always been fluid, are ready to accept the new even though the old will be thereby virtually eliminated. The former type have a great deal to say about Sakyamuni as a real scientist, thus affirming that the teachings of modern science are but a belated recognition of what he was teaching twenty-five centuries ago. 'The Buddhism of the Buddha is *scientific*. We see there our modern psychology, biology, physics, chemistry and astronomy anticipated. The Buddhism of the Buddha can be interpreted through modern science, either by actual scientific teaching or by scientific analogy.' The latter type would stress the thought that Buddhism is not a definite teaching but an attitude of spirit, a desire for truth no matter from where it comes, and just as in the past *Mahayana* Buddhism adjusted itself to the conditions in which it evolved, Buddhism to-day can make the same adjustments, preserving of the old, if need be, nothing but the spirit of free inquiry and adjustments.

As a rule this type of Buddhist is open-minded and often very friendly towards the Christian movement

in Japan. Many of these leaders would be quite ready to co-operate with Christian workers and many of them are doing something of the same sort of work that Christians are doing. It is this liberal and intelligent type of Buddhists that are building modern schools and colleges, publishing up-to-date magazines, pamphlets and books, organizing young people's societies, lecture meetings and summer schools, and carrying on various works of charity such as free dispensaries, care for ex-convicts and employment bureaux. They are even trying to modernize the life of the average Buddhist temple by organizing Sunday schools, women's societies, inter-denominational religious services and all similar activities which characterize modern Christianity and which are borrowed directly from Christianity, sometimes not merely as to method but even as to the content of the message.

It is obvious that it is this type of Buddhists with whom the Christian worker must reckon above all others. What is not altogether clear is just what attitude the Christian worker should take. The Christian worker should, of course, be friendly towards such Buddhists as individuals and probably in many ways he can co-operate with them in certain general reform movements such as the Purity Society, the Temperance Movement, the Peace Movement, etc. Whether he can go hand in hand with these Buddhists beyond such general movements will have to depend upon the answer to the question as to just what such Buddhists really stand for in the deepest things of the spirit. The Christian can agree with such Buddhists that truth is truth no matter from what source it comes, and also in his whole-hearted acceptance of all the good achievements of modern

science; but the Christian knows that there are some things in which the last word cannot be spoken even by modern science and in which it is still good sense to listen to one who spake with authority in matters of the spirit. The real trouble with such Buddhists is that in the very essentials of the spiritual life they are so uncertain and so hopelessly vague that one cannot tell what they really think or believe. They stand usually for a vague religious syncretism which makes room for everything but which does not stand clearly or positively for anything. To co-operate with such Buddhists in religious matters would often lead to rather embarrassing compromises. Here above all places the Christian worker must combine the grace of friendliness with the firmness that comes from positive convictions about the really big things in matters of the spirit.

The Free-Thinker

The fourth group with which the Christian worker in modern Japan has to deal is composed of that very large and rapidly growing section of Japanese society who, like the preceding group, have been greatly influenced by the new forces that have come in from the western world but who no longer look to Buddhism for anything. If they think of Buddhism at all they think of it as a superstition of the ignorant masses or as an impractical philosophy of old-fashioned philosophers, but certainly not as a real power in the life of the modern man. This group divides itself into two subdivisions, one being made up of those who are seeking a religious interpretation of life but who have not identified themselves with any historic religion, the other being made up of those

who have thrown all religion overboard as a real ' back number.'

It should be clear that the first type in this group are of all people in modern Japan the most accessible to the Christian worker. Their whole outlook on life is in many ways the same as that of an intelligent modern Christian, for they are largely the product of forces which are themselves essentially Christian in origin or which have had their development in close connexion with historic Christianity. Many in this group are as truly Christian already as most Christians, others are very near the Kingdom. It is the existence of this large group in Japan which accounts for the fact that the Christian movement in this land is far stronger than one would judge from the numerical strength of church members. The problem here is how organized Christianity in Japan can definitely win over these non-church Christians and semi-Christians and then through them reach the other groups. Whatever one's theory of the Church may be, organized Christianity is after all more efficient than unorganized, unless, of course, it exhausts itself in the mere running of the machinery of things.

The second subdivision in this group, i.e. those large numbers in modern Japan who are the product of modern forces that have come largely from the outside but who are indifferent to religion in any form, create the same sort of problem that this type of people create in our western world. What they want of life is the things which science creates—better food, better clothes, finer homes, interesting movies and all the external things in which modern civilization is so rich. Anything beyond these things they do not seriously seek or think of. The problem

here, as in the West, is how in the lives of such men and women a desire for the things of the spirit can be created and then met. It is the age-old problem which has always confronted the religious worker and before which man in his own strength, even the clever modern psycho-analyst, stands baffled. 'The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth : so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'

IV. CONCLUSION

It should be plain from what has been said above that we should think of present-day Buddhists primarily as men, women and children who are seeking in one way and another a fuller and richer life. For many the contents of an enriched life consist largely of external things, such as modern science provides in an ever-increasing variety. Others seek beyond these good things a nobler type of life for man as a citizen of a great modern state in which he can take pride and for which he is willing to sacrifice his own personal gain. And still others would add as the supreme good the things of the spirit which make man not only a noble citizen of a modern state but also a citizen of the Kingdom of Righteousness, whose borders know no bounds either in space or in time and whose King is the Eternal God.

That present-day Japanese cannot find adequate answers in their quest for these things by a return to Sakyamuni and his view of life should be evident from what was said in Section I and from the fact that even in the past they found no adequate answer there. That they cannot find very much help in

the historic forms of Buddhism which developed in Japan during the past thirteen centuries should be clear from the fact that the most progressive elements among present-day Buddhists are feverishly endeavouring to restate and radically change their faith until it conforms to the new standards set by conceptions and ideals of life which have come into Japan in recent years from the western world. So radical are the changes involved here that little but the name Buddhism can survive if the adjustment is made successfully. In fact, Buddhism in this situation ceases to be a force that transforms life and becomes largely a survival of the past to be saved itself by the infusing into it of something new.

Now the real question is whether Christianity can meet this quest for a fuller and richer life in all its aspects. Christianity has been responsible in a large measure, both directly and indirectly, for arousing in the hearts of Japanese, and for that matter in the hearts of the millions of Asia, great desires for life. Can it now meet the legitimate desires for an abundant life, or must these millions be sent back to the great Indian pessimist who held that human life and all desire for life, even the desire for a better life beyond this world, are vanity and a fetter of evil, and that there is no real hope but the hope of gaining release by a suppression of all desires for life ?

That Christianity, having furnished the setting in which modern science had its first great development, can enrich the life of Buddhists in the good things which science produces so lavishly, no one will question. Christianity has been doing that, is doing that and will continue to do that ; though it should be clear that if the Christian message is

merely the message of modern science, Christianity will become less and less essential, since the latter can now carry on fairly well without the help of organized Christianity.

That Christianity can help the peoples of Asia in their quest for an enriched life as citizens of a modern state is also plain. It is true that in Japan Christianity was feared as an enemy of the State because it put loyalty to God and conscience above loyalty to the State, but it is now generally recognized that the Christian ideal of character is such that if accepted it would make for real strength in national life. What Christians have done in the advancement of education, in various moral reforms and in different kinds of social service, leaves little question now in the minds of Japanese statesmen that Christianity can help Japan to achieve a higher national life. It is even admitted since the World War that Christianity is the one great religion which can help Japan to her rightful place in the fellowship of nations, though it should be added that the Exclusion Act of the American Congress in 1924 has somewhat shattered these hopes.

But after Christianity has helped modern Japanese and other Asiatics in their quests for the enrichment of life along these good and legitimate lines, the final question is: Can Christianity give an adequate response to man's deepest needs, his needs as a citizen of the kingdom of eternal values?

Here we face the crux of the main problem in the modern missionary enterprise and, in fact, in modern life. The problem is: Just how real and how permanent are our spiritual values? It is the question whether we moderns, Christians or Buddhists, can really believe that at the centre of things—in all,

through all and over all—is the Living God. And can we believe that the supreme value in human life is the value of an enriched personality and that such an enriched personality has permanent meaning and value ? And can we believe that all other gains in human life which mar this value, however desirable they may seem in themselves, are evil ? Or rather, is it possible to live life in such a way that the good things of life can be retained without these things becoming an enemy of the better and the best ?

Buddhism never had an adequate answer for these deepest things of the spirit, and no trimming of its sails to fit the winds that now blow across modern Asia from all corners of the world will help much. Can Christianity help adequately ?

Christianity cannot help here either unless its modern representatives become a little more certain about God, the Heavenly Father, and about Jesus Christ, in whose fellowship the Father becomes tremendously real and through whom man gains strength to live the free life of the spirit and is not the mere slave of his own creations in the externals of life

CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

THE LATE CANON W. H. T. GAIRDNER, B.A.
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF W. A. EDDY, PH.D.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: My work in the following pages is original work, but not new. In the impossibility of writing a new treatise as part of the preparation for the Missionary Conference of Jerusalem, 1928, I was compelled to fall back on the published material in which, at various times during the past nineteen years, I have expressed the results of my study and reflection on Islam, and which now, after renewed and careful consideration, seemed to me to be still valid, and therefore 'as good as new.' All that was needed was a unifying and vitalizing plan of thought, and an editor gifted with both sympathy and originality. The former is supplied by the general thesis which has been conceived by those responsible for the programme of the Jerusalem Conference, and then communicated to the writers of the several preparatory treatises. The latter was vouchsafed to me in the person of my friend, Dr W. A. Eddy, of the American University at Cairo. He has elaborated the plan of thought, collected and selected the material, and in certain important places supplemented it by the fruits of his own experience and reflection. I am infinitely beholden to him.

A missionary should indeed be heartily thankful to God for such an opportunity to offer to the members of a missionary conference representing so large a part of Christendom the net result of his thinking on the theme to which he has given his life. Its value will consist exclusively in what it draws forth from those who consider it.

W. H. T. G.

Since writing this paper Canon Gairdner has been taken to his rest. Only those who were in Cairo at the time know how his illness and death gripped all strata of the community with the sharp pain of personal and irretrievable loss. Among those who during the last days maintained an unbroken stream of intercessory prayer were numbered Muslims. His life and death were wrought out in the midst of a host of lovers, Muslim and Christian.

His paper is reprinted as he approved it, with only such trifling alterations as he had himself suggested.

WILLIAM A. EDDY

I. INTRODUCTION

IN the following pages a statement is presented of the values to be found in Islam and in Christianity. As we proceed to state religious values, it is important for the reader to bear in mind certain considerations:

(*a*) 'Values' is used to designate vital elements which contribute to the amelioration of individual or group life. This excludes purely relative 'advantages' which the religious system may appear to display in contrast to some sector of heathen society. It excludes also features which strengthen the system, but strengthen it to no good for the life of its adherents. For example, polygamy may be preferable to unlicensed promiscuity; yet in the light of the best social standards it is in no sense a value to be capitalized. Again, the Islamic law of apostasy is a defence of stone, which admits the recruit but prevents the deserter. As such, it facilitates the extension and retention of Muslim authority—but it does not enrich life, and is not a value.

(*b*) Values may be kinetic or potential. Some are operative to-day; others are matters of dogma and usage which are dormant. The extent to which a given value is operative or dormant will be indicated in each case.

(*c*) The limits of space require that the religions be described in universals. This necessarily debars, to a large extent, facts which have only local application. The regional and sectarian variations of faith and practice must be very largely ignored. Similarly, in point of chronology, there will be no time

to mark the stages through which the religious systems may have passed since the days of their founders. We will have in mind Islam and Christianity as they have developed historically.

In Islam, more important than the historic sects is the division into three communities of religious thought, which is now on the increase in the principal centres of Muslim culture: (1) The traditional school: reactionary, literalist, bigoted. (2) The liberal school: rationalizing, compromising, eclectic; sometimes, as in the case of the Ahmadiyya sect, openly aggressive. (3) The secular community: agnostic, materialistic, anti-religious, but socially bound to Islam. Obviously, the religious values hereinafter ascribed to Islam are not present equally in all three of these schools or communities. Yet this lack of unity must, in this brief statement, also be set aside. The liberal and agnostic groups, though active and audible, are numerically slight. It is safe to say that 90 per cent of the Muslims in the world are still under the tutelage of the traditional orthodox Sunni school.

II. VALUES IN ISLAM.

Doctrine of God

The Arabian prophet came to possess a fervid faith in Allah—the One God. Not only did he come to possess it; it came to possess him. He felt that he had *experienced* Allah, a living, absolutely all-powerful and irresistible being. The same faith is shared by his followers, with very varying degrees of reality and intensity, to-day.

The language and imagery of the Quran and the Traditions in speaking of God often employ as startling metaphors and images as the Old Testament, and such language has been for the most part interpreted with prosaic literalism. While the ideas of love and pity are present (as indicated by the names 'The Compassionate,' 'The Guardian,' 'The Forgiver,' etc.) it is true generally to say that the predominating thought in the mind of the Muslim is that of the *power* of God. This power is conceived of as Omnipotent, Autocratic, Absolute, because Allah is the supreme, nay the only, Reality.

This faith in a living God who wills and acts is a vital element for the future of religion in Muslim lands. Moreover, it was never more needed in the 'Christian' West than to-day; to import into Muslim areas a diluted notion of divine kingship would be a fatal error. The annals of history point clearly how irresistible Muslims have been, in conflicts of the sword, when engaged in a jihâd against decadent or unspiritual Christians. In spiritual conflict a like burning faith is equally effective. It is true, on the other hand, that this faith energizes the Muslim only when it is in ebullition. At other times it sinks into a deadly fatalism which, instead of goading to action, paralyses it. It needs the angel to trouble the pool.

A heavy price is paid by the Muslims for their worship of unconditioned Might: it appears to involve the disappearance of both Love and Holiness in any full sense of the words. It causes no surprise, but only regret, to find that Islam has no place for Atonement, for the fact of atonement sprang from God's Love and Holiness. But the uniqueness and living supremacy of Allah have sounded forth

from every minaret through the centuries and halfway round the world.

The heart of every religion is its doctrine of God. When we strip the Mohammedan doctrine of Allah of all that is admittedly of theoretic interest, it would appear that what is of living significance to Muslims is this conviction of theirs that Allah *is*, that He is more than a principle or an 'influence not themselves,' that He is a personal force and that He has a definite relation to the world. This faith unquestionably affects the whole thinking and doing of Mohammedans. It may not always produce a particularly ethical fruit, but it is what to them matters. It gives them a steady, if stiff, *Weltanschauung*; it very often enables them to face loss, trouble and adversity with complete stoicism. Though the length to which they have pushed deism might seem to imply a hopelessly remote deity, their conception of the unmitigated omnipotence of Allah brings Him virtually near—for man is every way surrounded by, nay, himself exists through the immediate working of Allah's will and power. And though their conviction of the absolute 'difference' between Allah's nature and attributes and their own logically leads to complete agnosticism, yet as we shall see later they find ways through which there is given them an approach to Allah and the unseen world: the way of revelation through the Prophet and his Book, and the way of Mysticism.

Less clear, but by no means unimportant, is the teaching of Islam regarding the Holy Spirit; and for the Christian missionary who looks into the seeds of mysticism, this will be recognized as one which can grow and bear much fruit.

So rigidly have Muslim theologians fenced about the Oneness of Allah that they have begged the question of the Communicator of Allah's revelation to man ; but the Quranic teaching at least permits, nay indicates, a mysterious special relationship between this Communicator and Godhead Itself. The Spirit of God is mentioned twenty times in the Quran. From these passages the following summary of the best mystical Islamic teaching about the Spirit is significant :

1. The Spirit is shrouded in mystery, and even to Mohammed ' only a little ' knowledge of It is given.

2. The Spirit is spoken of as The Spirit of Allah, always linked to His name or to the personal possessive pronoun.[1] It proceeds from Him as breath from the body. The Spirit is above both men and angels, both in degree and in kind : it is even uncertain whether it can properly be said to be created.

3. The Spirit was breathed *into man*, thus establishing the uniqueness of man's creation and his dependence upon Allah for spiritual vitality. It was also breathed into the Blessed Virgin Mary.

4. The Spirit is limitless, capable of being infused into countless personalities without diminution or loss of identity.

The reader must be warned that the commonest (yet not the only or the noblest) interpretation of this teaching by the commentators is to identify the Spirit with one of the arch-angelic hierarchy. But Christians will find that they have been anticipated by some of the best Muslim mystics in suggesting a nobler solution. Mohammed himself

[1] The Quranic expressions are ' The Spirit of Allah,' ' His Spirit,' ' The Holy (=Transcendent) Spirit,' ' The Spirit of the (divine) Holiness (=Transcendence).'

wrote freely of the angels, whereas with respect to the Spirit he *contrasts* It with the angels and postulates a mystery. If his awful Visitant was none other than The Spirit, then It was a being altogether higher than the angels, for he describes It as ' endued with power, having influence with the Lord of the Throne, obeyed ' (by celestials, surely). There results the noblest and most convincing interpretation attempted by Islamic thinkers, namely : the Spirit is a unique Being, above *all* creatures, related uniquely, intimately and actively to the Lord of the Throne.

This teaching, though rare, to the multitude unknown, and even for adepts full of awesome and dangerous mystery, is a part of what Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil. It seems clear that Muslim theologians, though following the way to truth, wavered when within a step of their goal out of respect for their commendable belief in the Unity of the Deity. They saw the transcendental character of the Spirit, even admitted (some of them) that It is uncreate, but hesitated to admit Its Eternity. In many of His attributes, the Spirit of the Quran is the Holy Spirit of the Bible, or at least the Old Testament, in all but name.

And to this we must add another point in connexion with the Islamic doctrine of God from which we can profit more than we have in the past. In the strange Muslim version of the Logos doctrine, Islam seems again to be groping after a truth which Christianity richly possesses. This doctrine, like that of the Spirit, is out of keeping with the general trend of Muslim theological thought and has been very embarrassing to the sincere theologians of Islam. According to this doctrine, Allah had, as

one of His eternal attributes, a Word, which Word ' became ' a Book with a divine message. The nature of this pre-existence ; the relation of that Word in eternity to that Quran in time ; the question how to conceive the transition from the eternal to the temporal order—these have proved questions metaphysically as perplexing to the Muslim as to the Christian theologian. But for that very reason they enable the latter to present the idea of the Christian Logos to the Muslim as something not inherently impossible, even if difficult of grasping ; something the need of which Muslims themselves have felt and tried to import into Islam even against the whole trend of the system ; something which, just because it is so entirely in line with all Christian thought, will be found in Christianity more fully developed and much more satisfying by just as much as a conscious Personality is of greater dignity than an impersonal Book. Again, the hints dropped in the Quran and the Traditions of a special Real Presence of God locally as well as morally (in the Burning Bush, in the ' Lowest Heaven,' and the like), might be used more than they are to press home the possibility of a Real Presence in Christ, and to urge its greater reasonableness by just so much as a sinless human body is of greater dignity than desert shrub or intermediate heaven.

Veneration for Jesus

Islam is the only one of the great world religions to come after Christianity ; the only one that claims categorically to supersede Christianity and deny its truth. On the other hand, it is the only other religion which tells anything about Jesus.

Islam has ever accorded to Jesus a high place among its prophets. This in itself is something. Moreover, Jesus is for Muslims a uniquely distinguished prophet on at least two counts: (1) He is acknowledged to be sinless in origin and spotless in character; (2) He is described as *living* in high heaven where He is an intercessor (*wagih*) on behalf of men. Many of the other teachings about Jesus are distorted and worse than useless; but surely, here is something of real value for the Christian missionary to build on. It has produced respect for Jesus, admiration for His example and a willingness to admit His living power and influence with God.

Unfortunately, Jesus does not at all occupy so large a place in the common life and thought of Muslims the world over as He would merit in view of the high place accorded him in the Quran. The truth is that Muslims do not think much about any of their prophets other than Mohammed. It is equally true, however, that this was not always so. Evidence exists to prove that in the centuries which preceded the Crusades, after which a hardening process sets in, the figure of Jesus, yes even of the Crucified, was to thoughtful Muslims a vitally inspiring one. In those early days, His character had a marked ethical effect and the grace and beauty of His Person caused some Muslim hearts to burn within them. The most hopeful single note in the Islamic world to-day is the, to many, irresistible attraction of the Person of Jesus Christ.[1]

[1] Shauky, the noted poet-laureate of Cairo and a Muslim, has been taken to task by Muslim critics for adorning his poems with tributes to the beauty and glory of the Person of Jesus, and specially of the *crucified* Jesus.

If the Muslim Allah is a cold and strange dictator when contrasted with the Christian God and Father, still less is the 'Isa of the Quran identical with the Jesus of the Gospels. It is as though an imperfect artist, after a visit to Dresden, tried to draw the face of the Sistine Madonna from memory. The result would give no true copy, not even perhaps the faintest resemblance. *Yet a true copy was intended.* It was to have been the Sistine Madonna and no other. Only on allowing this assumption could a wise teacher point out where and how the work had so utterly failed. Imperfect, distorted, null beyond words to express nullity, may be the Mohammedan representation of our Jesus in his 'Isa. Yet it represents his honest, his earnest attempt, and the Christian cannot but begin on that understanding, and then try to show his friend feature after feature, lovely and glorious, of the true portrait. The mental image formed by Apollos of the Christ he preached at Ephesus may have seemed to Aquila and Priscilla extraordinarily unlike the adored Jesus whom they knew. Yet their dealing with Apollos is summed up in that gentle remark, ' They took him and expounded unto him the way of God more carefully.' And so while the Figure before Apollos' eyes did not move, the mists that concealed It disappeared, and Its divine glory shone full out. The Islamic teaching about Jesus invites our sympathy in a similar way, especially as Christianity is, historically, partly responsible for the distortions, for Mohammed's source was the odds and ends of garbled apocrypha. The Islamic teaching is not intentionally derogatory or antagonistic to the claims of Christ ; it is an attempt to venerate and esteem Him. Muslims do not know that He is

the Son of God, but neither did the twelve disciples, at first.

All these limitations do indeed enormously discount this ' value ' ; so much so that it often seems to the Christian preacher that it would have been better if they had known nothing at all, rather than mis-know so much. It is indeed an altar to an Unknown Christ which Islam has erected, though it does not even know that He is unknown : and our approach must be Paul's—' Whom ye venerate unknowing, Him declare we unto you.'

Devotional Life

Muslims, at any rate in unsophisticated lands and in country districts, are punctual and faithful in the performance of the ordinance of prayer. Solitary worshippers may be seen in the many-mansioned House of Islam—camel-driver in the desert, farmer in the field, boatman on his barge, porter on a bench in the railway station, doorkeeper at the foot of the common stair, fisherman on the beach by the sea, traveller by the wayside. No one takes any notice of the sight or calls attention to it. Neither in passer-by nor in worshipper is there embarrassment or surprise.

In mosque-prayer there is genuine ' equality and fraternity.' The band of worshippers executes the ritual with machine-like precision : the Shaykh in his flowing robes leading ; behind him in rows, shoulder to shoulder, well-dressed gentlemen, coarsely clad workmen from the streets, negroes, young boys. Thus has statutory prayer been performed for thirteen centuries ; thus, without deviation, shall it be performed while Islam lasts.

Although pious Muslims have denied the charge, it is probably true that spiritual emotion is usually absent from these 'duty' prayers. This is not to say that they are therefore universally vain repetitions. There is at least the discipline that comes with frequent and regular concentration upon the thought of God, or ar least on a religious exercise—a concentration achieved by Muslim worshippers even amid crowded traffic. Wherever he may be, the Muslim has learned, during his prayers, to be alone with himself; some of the Muslims to be alone with God.

But as a rule, not through the five daily statutory prayers does the element of feeling enter into Muslim devotions. The æsthetic senses at least are stirred much more by the highly elaborate, ornate chanting of the Quran at feast or fast or festivity; an art, the delight of which is born half of music and half of word, that gives him the element of uplift which in the West is found in storied window, in pealing organ, in melodies and harmonies that thrill and uplift the soul. The susceptibility of the Muslim to the reading of the Quran suggests that beauty in the reading of prayer or scripture in our own churches should be much more earnestly studied.

Much more emotional is the Zikr. The faces of the enthusiasts as they wildly sway, bow, or whirl in the mystic prayer-dance, with their rhythmic, raucous cries upon Allah, are evidences of psychic excitement. But however valuable the Zikr may have originally been for devotion, it would seem to have degenerated badly through formulation and general use. The ecstasy attained is hypnotic, not spiritual. Its significance lies in the fact that it was once a powerful stimulus to real devotions,

and might be adapted so as to become so again; and in the fact that its popularity with common folk would seem to prove a hunger for more ecstatic, heartfelt prayer on the part of the more devout and mystical minds which have never been satisfied with the prescribed devotional ritual. The Sufi life is not obligatory; it is voluntary, and as such gathers to itself the devotion and enthusiasm of those who are not content to fulfil only the letter of the law. The 'Way' of the Sufi is the mystic Pilgrim's Progress to perfection. The 'Ways' of the various Sufi orders, all of them slightly different, with their Zikr rituals, also differing in their details, are the mode by which the soul can rise to a period of union with the divine All. These orders have had a prodigious development all over the Islamic world, but particularly in North Africa, in Turkey and in Persia. To belong to them it is not necessary to enter a community life apart. The ordinary man can be affiliated to one or other of them, put himself under the spiritual direction of the local Head and attend the local Zikrs. Thus millions of the commonalty of Islam, desert tribesmen, peasants, shopkeepers, tradesmen, feed their emotional life and find their chief interest in religion.

The value of the Muslim mystic's 'Way' may well be questioned in relation to the 'Truth' and the 'Life.' But contrasted with the rigidity of formal Islamic ordinances, the 'Way' does provide at least the ideal of life in and for God. And in actual practice it feeds, howsoever inadequately, the flame of emotional, fervent religious experience, without which there can be no real religious life at all.

Personal Attachment to Mohammed

Another aspect of the Muslim's religion which is unquestionably vital to him is his personal attitude to his prophet. The clause 'Mohammed is *the* Prophet of Allah,' is at least as essential and significant an article of faith to him as, 'There is no God but Allah.' The Muslim's devotion to his Prophet, his admiration and enthusiasm, nay his personal love for him, are intense realities. He feels a personal relationship to him; he is conscious of a personal gratitude for the ineffable services he has rendered. He believes that Mohammed suffered and sacrificed in loyalty to his mission. Sometimes he throws over theological or philosophical proofs of the truth of Islam, and points simply to the fact of Mohammed.

It was this devotion to the man Mohammed in the earliest days, it is this still to-day, that has made possible the development of Islam as a system of minute legalism and casuistry, based upon the practice of that man even more than upon the word of Allah. It is remarkable to reflect how Christianity, which regarded its Founder as divine, never preserved, much less invented, minutiæ concerning His daily life, and so was saved from enslaving itself to a new system of law; while Islam, the very religion which arose to protest against the excessive esteeming of any man, ended by binding itself hand and foot and for all generations to one man's dictation, in both private and public life.

The vitality of Muslim devotion to their prophet is reflected also in the progressive idealization of Mohammed's personality by his followers. With absolute unanimity from the first, Islam has vehe-

mently insisted upon his impeccability in the teeth of the very text of the Quran and of the clearest historical evidence contained in the literary sources themselves. The adoration of celestial beings for his person and the marvellous response of all physical nature to his advent on earth, are the favourite themes of the *maulid* poets, who celebrate the Prophet's birthday. The later mystics even advanced to an esoteric philosophy of the Prophet's cosmic significance, in which an archetypical pre-existence is asserted for him. And everywhere among the vital forces of Islam must be reckoned this ethical enthusiasm—an enthusiasm of devotion and loyalty to a personal, human, but wholly idealized leader.

Much is often made of the immediacy of the Muslim's relation to Allah. In practice this doctrine has broken down in favour of a mediator, Mohammed. Islam has felt the need of an intercessor, and it has fervently elevated Mohammed to that function. He is thought of as no mere passive instrument of Allah's revelation, but as a superman who brought to them the heavenly fire and was in turn their ambassador, to plead their needs and secure for them preference. What Moses was to the Israelites, Mohammed is to the Muslims, and more, for Mohammed is greater than all the prophets : he represents all the prophets put together.

That this feature of Islam contains possibilities of moral progress is undeniable. It is to be expected that its value to human life will increase in unconscious response to other and finer moral and spiritual ideals. The Muslim is seen groping for an intercessor who shall have been, also, an ideal man. One has only to substitute the Person of Jesus for the person of Mohammed to visualize the possi-

bilities latent in this aspect of the life of Islam. Whether our duty is negative as well as positive, truthfully to point out inadequacy of the real Mohammed as well as set forth Jesus Christ, is a very hard question. It is very difficult for us to do this in the right spirit, or at least to appear to be doing so. Some think that all Mohammed-criticism is best left to Mohammedans themselves, to time and to truth.

Islamic Fraternity

Another reality of the Muslim's religious life is his pride in his religion, its position as the latest and last of the religions, its triumphs, its literature and its learning, its saints and its sages. It is this, and his consciousness of its universality for men of every colour and every tongue, that account for one of Islam's most notable achievements—the sense of Muslim fraternity.

For Islam is by no means merely a personal religion; it is also, like Hinduism and mediæval Catholicism, a great encyclopædic system intended to cover the totality of human life. It is a *legal* system: for the canon-law covers human life down to its smallest details; it is a *social* system: governing those two subjects which lie at the basis of all society, sex and property, through its control of marriage, divorce and inheritance. It is a *culture*: for it has produced a literature, an art and a philosophy; it is a *nationality*—less so to-day, indeed, than a decade ago, but still there remains a conscious or unconscious sense of political unity, with its focus in the institution of the Caliphate. In idea and essence Islam is a veritable church-state which takes charge of every Muslim in infancy, moulds

his acts and thoughts at every stage of his life, weds him and buries him and finally disposes of his property. Islam is well-nigh everything to the Muslim.

The hold which this system exercises upon its adherents is to be understood only in the light of Islam's many-sided prestige. There is theological prestige in being the company of the only true believers, in being the 'chosen people.' There is the prestige of the Prophet's leadership, of the world-wide fraternity, of the Mecca where all meet, of the Paradise which will be the Muslim's monopoly in the next world. All this creates an *esprit de corps* which has no room for any other loyalty, with the most gigantic inhibitions of blood, culture, sentiment and habit, to deter the enquirer after truth.

If there is one element which more than any other deserves our serious attention and to some extent our admiration, it is this fundamental fact of Islamic brotherhood. However grave be its limitations, both in its spirit and in its negative applications, it is, on its own plane, a real achievement. It does introduce a factor of actual unity amid the clashes of colour, race, nationality and class. It is true that the light of this fraternity shows up most vividly only when faced with apparent antagonism from the West. It is also true that in itself it has done nothing to stop bloodshed and war even within Islam. But apart from all this, Islamic fraternity as a unifying factor is a real thing, and beyond all other things in Islam gives occasion for meditation and thought to all Christians, and especially to those who might be inclined to stress Christian individualism at the expense of that 'dwelling together in unity' willed by Him who was lifted up that He might draw all men unto Himself.

The admirers of Islam to-day say that it is the only working brotherhood available for this distracted world, the only unifying factor amid all its antipathies and frictions, the only feasible catholicism. We can never allow this claim, for however generously we may concede to the Islamic fraternity idea our admiration, and find in it our rebuke, we cannot forget its fatal and even ghastly limitations. But it is utterly insufficient to disallow the claim merely in words. Islamic fraternity, that of a 'chosen people,' will be superseded in only one way, and for that we have a precedent: by the demonstration of a brotherhood which goes deeper, reaches further, rises higher and embraces more widely. We shall come to this again.

Self-Propagation

It is a particular and well-founded boast with Mohammedans that, broadly speaking, Islam has propagated itself naturally and without the aid of missionary societies and apparatus; that Islam adds cubits to its stature without taking anxious thought. Their boast is that Islam is, in and by itself, a vast missionary society, and the spontaneity of Islamic expansion seems to them a sign of power, symbolic of a divine dynamo.

In truth, nearly every Muslim is a sort of missionary or emissary of Islam. The trader, or soldier, or official, when he enters non-Mohammedan territory does not 'wait for an ordained man' to come along: he sees to it that some sort of praying-place is fixed upon, and there he gives to the surrounding people the witness of his picturesque devotions. He does not mentally and actually leave the business

of that witness to some groaning missionary society with a perpetual annual deficit, several thousand miles away. The Muslim layman simply starts witnessing himself, and his witness (such as it is) is short and clear. And there is something about his attitude and the tone of his witness which does succeed in conveying to that people that they are welcome to accept Islam, welcome to join him at that praying-place, to learn the picturesque drill of his devotions and to repeat with him the creed of witness : and that if they are so disposed he will teach them something, however mechanical and formal, or see that they get taught. In short, there is something about his general attitude which suggests that although on principle he is unfraternal towards them (and occasionally hatefully and inhumanly so) as long as they remain outside, he will be fraternal as soon as they decide to step within. There is something about the attitude of every Muslim man, woman and child which says ' Welcome.' This is the fundamental attitude we need to get back into the Church of Christ.

It is a painful process to contrast this with what actually obtains too often in our case, partly in consequence of the general western attitude of aloofness which we more than fully carry with our religion, partly because of profound colour-caste prejudice and partly because of sheer misapprehension of our own religion.

The propaganda of the two religions is wholly unequal : simple for Islam, complex for Christianity. Islam is spread by lay missionaries who mix and intermarry with their converts, thus gradually and inevitably occupying the country. Christianity has been for the most part spread by ' foreigners ' for

whom the race problem is no mere prejudice. For it is gravely to be doubted whether humanity is benefited, and whether God is served, by the mixing of white with black or brown or yellow. Be this as it may, so long as missions are chiefly 'foreign,' just so long will the cultural and biological advantages of assimilation be on the side of Islam. The problem, therefore, points urgently toward the shifting of missionary effort on to the native Churches, where Muslim converts shall find a full and congenial home. For the modern method of missionary societies was not the early one, and the Islamic method is not the monopoly of Islam. It was the first method of the Church, it continued long to be its method, and its greatest conquests were thereby won.

It is true that, to the eternal discredit of Islam, the Muslim missionary is capable of leaving the morals of his converts practically undisturbed. As one Muslim writer in Cairo put it (speaking more truly than he knew), 'Christianity opposes, Islam follows, the current of human nature.' This fact discredits Islam, but does not diminish the credit due to the Muslim missionary, who testifies to his religion, such as it is, and seeks its extension. It is probably true that of no other religion in the world can it be said that every believer is, to the extent of his own faith and practice, thereby a missionary.

Liberal Tendencies

More especially since the war, breaches have been appearing in the solid front of Islam. To a great extent these point to agnosticism and irreligion, rather than to a truer religious experience, and as

such may be considered by some as being without positive value to the future of missions. It is a proof of dissatisfaction, and gives the promise of wide reform, and of the acceptance of a better way.

Already the note of dissatisfaction with the Quran can be clearly detected. Not for ever has the Mohammedan been able to shut his eyes to the puerilities that fill so many of its pages, the contradiction between its commendation of the previous 'Books' and its still unexplained disagreement with those Books' contents. These and other difficulties have long caused individual Muslims dissatisfaction and doubt. Already a critical theory, irreconcilable with the form in which the book is cast (throughout, a direct address from the Deity), has been attempted in India, while the rationalizings of the Ahmadiyya sect in England and elsewhere are notorious. The greatest effort is still made in the interests of orthodoxy, the attempt to square the Quran with science, history and morality. But in recent years, thousands of intellectuals have thrown over the whole business, and, in private, regard the Quran with indifferent contempt These disclaim belief in any revealed religion, seldom if ever attend a mosque. They number many who are students in foreign schools, and especially those who have been educated abroad. What especially outrages and discourages the orthodox is that these free-thinkers occupy the highest temporal posts, as, for example, in Turkey and Egypt.

Usually, these rationalists represent a defection from Islam. They do not mix in religious controversy; and though their attachment to cultural Islam remains, they ignore or discourage all theological issues. Already, however, there are indications of liberalism *within* the citadel. In Cairo, two noted

Azhar scholars, Taha Hussayn and Abd-el-Razik, have published books in which the literary and historic infallibility of the Quran and the political aspirations of Islam have been directly challenged. And the Azhar has its own internal quarrels, with its personnel in two camps more or less corresponding to 'modernist' and 'fundamentalist.' In those schools of Cairo which are patterned after the western colleges, the Quran is something of a joke, and the student who quotes it in argument is publicly ridiculed by his fellows.

Dissatisfaction with the moral ideal presented by Mohammed's character is already beginning to be felt. One comes across Muslims who have realized that, side by side with the Traditions ascribing to the Prophet pious dictum and genial deed, there are stories which show that often he rose no higher than current Arab ideals and Arab practice. As incidents in the life of an Arab conqueror, the tales of raiding, private assassinations and public executions, perpetual enlargements of the harem, and so forth, might be historically explicable and therefore pardonable; but it is another matter that they should be taken as setting forth the moral ideal for all time. As the mythical is sifted from the historical in the Traditions concerning the biography of Mohammed, the old idealizing of Mohammed will become more difficult.

Again, the mortmain which Islamic law has kept on the freedom of social and cultural development is resented by many a thinker and reformer. The veil, polygamy, the eternal inequality lying at the root of the conception of the Muslim State, are for the most part things which reformers are burning to change, and concerning which the metropolitan Arabic news-

papers use language which is neither ambiguous nor reverent. Nor need we think only of Turkey. In many centres of Muslim culture, western secularism is openly advocated. There is a frank recognition of the fact that Christian nations are more advanced, even though credit for the superiority be not awarded to the Christian religion.

This dissatisfaction with Islam does not mean a readiness to embrace Christianity or any other religion; but it does show self-criticism and the collapse of Islamic pride and assurance in proportion as the critical spirit spreads. The propaganda of the Ahmadiyya sect is an insolent and aggressive attempt by a few to find a new basis for strategy and for publicity intended for western consumption; and it is doing great harm to the cause of Christianity by its unscrupulous libels on the Gospel and on Christ. But it captures few Muslims with its programme (outside India); the normal step for the critic is from orthodoxy to agnosticism and secularism. In Cairo to-day, this step is for the young Effendi an easy one, for the culture and logic of the Azhar are despised, and even teachers of Arabic and of religion are discarding the religious garb. The diploma of the Azhar has depreciated until it has approached the vanishing point, and the graduate has difficulty in securing government employment. This, in a country whose state religion is Islam! This, in the university which has been for centuries the authoritative source of Islam's intellectual life!

In one respect the revolt has gone far: political Islam is in disruption. Turkey's rulers have virtually repudiated the Mohammedan religion. Their defection has alienated Egypt and staggered India. Persia is Shia and separatist. Mohammedan India is in a

strait between Indian and Islamic unity. Between all these irreconcilable divisions, the Caliphate question has become an insoluble one, and so the visible symbol of Mohammedan unity is gone.

There remain for notice two other liberal tendencies whose value is definitely constructive. Muslims of all classes and in many regions are evidencing a tolerance towards the Christian missionary which is nowhere permitted in the Quran and was seldom practised a decade ago. The past ten years have been difficult ones in Mohammedan countries, but the fact is gaining recognition that it is secular politics that has been everywhere the factor of disturbance, and that missions and missionaries have been everywhere the moderating and alleviating factors, and sometimes the only ones. Mohammedans see that missionaries are free from the political and economic motives which appear to infringe their legitimate interests. In the welter of exacerbated relations in Turkey and Anatolia, the missionaries were seen to be the one rallying-point of mutual consideration, understanding and forgiveness. In Syria, Palestine, Persia and Egypt there has been wide recognition of the idea that the missionaries sympathized with true nationalism, and on more than one occasion they have been markedly exempted from anti-foreign demonstrations. The Gospel is now being preached freely in Muslim communities where less than a generation ago the preacher would have been ejected. Native Christians have a wide field for witness. Entirely apart from the number of converts made, Muslims have learned to respect, nay to love, at least *some* of those who bear the name of Christ.

And finally, the character of Christ does attract the Mohammedan, and is doing so more and more. Many

a Muslim, when he has placed it fairly alongside of the character of Mohammed, has seen the immeasurable difference. One cannot measure the potential importance of this fact, should the question at issue between the two faiths tend to resolve itself more and more into a conflict between two ethical ideals, as lying at the root of the difference between the two theologies. It is along this line that we have the best cause for hope that there is coming a real awakening of Islam.

By-Products of Islam

The foregoing analysis of the values in Islam has been based upon Islam at its best. A statement of the defects in Islam would occupy greater space. The criticism most likely to be made is that we have been too generous.

But we can afford to be generous ; Islam has been convincingly exposed by a cloud of witnesses, writing from wide and accurate observation. The moral and social failure, especially, forms now a familiar picture.

Among the social virtues possessed by the peoples of Islam, many are racial or national ; some are to be credited to the influence of Islam itself. We simply list these latter at this point to complete the credit due to this rival religion :

1. *Veneration of holy men.* Every locality has its honoured saints, men who, fulfilling the moral and ceremonial code of Islam, are accounted holy. This admiration for holiness, inadequate and formal though it be, produces a respect for virtue as the Muslim sees it.
2. *Respect for parents and the aged.*
3. *Compassion,* manifesting itself notably in

patience with beggars and unfortunates, the giving of alms and kindness to animals.

4. *Resignation under affliction.*

5. *Abstinence from alcoholic beverages, gambling and usury.*

6. *Abhorrence of idolatry.*

7. *Efficient religious education of all children.*

III. VALUES IN CHRISTIANITY

The following pages are likely to appear out of focus, unless the reader remembers that it is no part of our present task to evaluate the essentials of Christianity, but only to emphasize afresh those features of the Christian message and experience which are of first importance in the conflict with Islam. There is *no* element of Christianity which is not needed desperately in Muslim lands, as elsewhere. We can note here only those elements which specifically cure the maladies and fill the voids created by Islam.

Enrichment of Islamic Half-truths

Before entering upon the more distinctive features of the Christian message, we bring together for brief consideration some of the vital elements of theology, which the preceding pages have shown to be already found in Islam, although dimly perceived and neglected or distorted.

A. The Concept of God

The conviction that the hard, deistic doctrine of God which Muslims profess is barren and dishonouring

has steadily grown in recent years in proportion as it has been realized how non-moral are the notions of Will and Force in themselves. Power is nothing but a physical category, unless united ever and always with Holiness and Love. In fact, thinkers have come more and more to feel that loveless will-force is the contradiction, the very opposite of Christ's revelation of God. The Muslim must be freed from the dread of this inscrutable Despot, and taught to pray to 'Our Father.'

Islam by the shallowness of its ethical conceptions of Allah drives us to emphasize afresh these two burning attributes of God the Father: His Holiness and His Love. The dogma of Omnipotence must itself be thought out afresh and brought into relation with eternal values: unconditioned physical Might being subordinated to God's ethical Omnipotence, according to which the weakness of God is stronger than the strength of man, and the Cross becomes the sign of victory. It is true that the Christian does not claim to have fully solved the problems of the Will of God and the will of man, of universal love and the existence of sin and sorrow. But he must tolerate the philosophic antinomy rather than offer his faith to unrational, unmoral Almightiness. The Muslims must be led to enthrone God morally at all costs. God is indeed One; God is indeed Almighty. But He who is not Holiness and Love is not God.

B. Providence

Although, as we have seen, Islamic fatalism brings with it patience, resignation and fortitude, its evil effects are consistent and far-reaching. 'Allah wills it' is a noble sentiment only when we are sure of

God's true attitude to any particular matter. In Islam *inshallah* and *mashallah* have resulted in a quietism and a *laissez-faire* attitude in the face of sin and social suffering that is intolerable. It is possible to admire the spirit which accepts without murmur, disaster in earthquake, fire and flood; but when this passive spirit of acceptance is extended to preventable evil, physical or moral, then the concept of the Will of God must be challenged and revised. At the expense of appearing to obscure the proofs of divine omnipotence, Christianity must insist upon God's desire for man's co-operation in reclaiming the waste places of this world. The Sacrifice on the Cross, His 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem!', His rebuke to Peter in the garden, nay a hundred truths, have taught the Christian what his Muslim brother does not know: that God appeals to man's love, but does not compel his obedience; that He seeks communion with man which shall be by man freely given. To the Muslim this seems like blasphemy—that God in seeking man to be His co-worker should seem to be in need of him. To the Christian there is no other way. God's providence does indeed control all, but it is a providence of love, not of imposed and irresistible power.

C. Immortality

The Muslim does indeed believe in and hope for a future life, in which there shall be reward and punishment. The belief and hope are real; but they are vitiated by the nature of the Paradise that is hoped for, and by the conception of the faith which is the passport into that Paradise.

At bottom Islam teaches that what saves is the creed 'There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed

is the Prophet of Allah.' The most criminal Muslim wins through to Paradise on the strength of this creed: he will have to suffer purgatorial or rather penal pains, to make up for the adverse balance in his account of deeds; but every Muslim will in the end be saved, whereas it is an open question whether any 'unbeliever' will be. This points to a conception of faith that is in the extreme poor, unethical and unspiritual. It is not 'the faith that worketh by love,' that is in itself a regenerating power because it means the surrender of the whole man to a perfect Being. Assent to a creed, observance of the ceremonial, performance of the fixed duties, are sufficient. There have been times and places where Christianity has, unfortunately, seemed to make similarly barren demands upon its adherents; and the fact that some of the Oriental Churches in Muslim lands have tended to lapse into unfruitful 'orthodoxy' does not help the Muslim to an ethical conception of salvation, nor to a moral idea of the future life.

Again, there is little in the representations of Paradise given in the Quran itself to uplift the soul; it is first and foremost a garden of delights of either a gaudy or a sensual nature. Attempts have been made, it is true, to work up the more spiritual hints given in the Quran, and to spiritualize the gross imagery employed. The 'beholding of the face of God' may be emphasized as the supreme joy of heaven. But the literalness of the sensual joys remains, and it is not permitted even to the mystics to explain them away—it is notable that even al Ghazzali, when elaborating the doctrine of the Garden for general consumption, outdoes others in sensuality. In fact, orthodoxy cannot go far in a spiritual interpretation; and the huge mass of

Muslims always have taken, and always will take, the description of Paradise in a literal sense: and necessarily so.

There is simply no comparison between this sensual imagery and that of the Book of Revelation. The latter is clean, beautiful and simple: the spiritual antitype of every image is clearly indicated at every turn. It immediately kindles *spiritual* emotions. The curse of the Quranic imagery is that its direct and significant appeal is *carnal*, and that it stimulates that in the Oriental which stands in least need of being stimulated.

The Muslim needs a spiritual heaven; a heaven achieved by a faith that responds to a grace both of which work by holiness and love; a heaven which begins on earth in communion with the true God, and which beyond the veil consists in the perfection of that communion.

D. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

As we have seen, Islam has approached very close to a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, though this is in no sense a living doctrine which influences daily life; it is a purely theological mystery, the concern of theologians and mystics. But we have seen that implicitly, as well as to some extent explicitly, the teaching is present in the Quran. However garbled and impoverished it may appear, it must be remembered that the sources of this doctrine are the Old and New Testament teaching of the Holy Spirit, imperfectly comprehended by Mohammed. It is at once legitimate and urgent that these same Christian sources be invoked to clarify and vitalize the Islamic teaching about the Spirit.

It is the duty of the Christian to show his Muslim brother that the Spirit of the Quran, which was breathed into man, which led the prophets, which was imparted to the Blessed Virgin Mary, must be sought and will be found in the Gospel. It is an act of kindness to show that 'the heavenly Commander, who moves the heavens . . . and is related to the Pure Being of God as the sun is related to essential light,' [1] is not a sort of second and inferior deity, but is God in our hearts. The glorious truth is that the Christian synthesis yields a true monotheism, which the Muslim dilemma does not. On the other hand, it is equally legitimate and urgent that we allow the mystical experiences of the greatest Muslims to have been genuine attempts to apprehend the mystery of the Holy Spirit. In humility and generosity let us confess that He *is* a mystery; but that the only full revelation of Him is to be found in Christ.

E. Doctrine of an Intercessor

The sages of Islam and the Quran itself teach that Jesus lives in heaven, where He has some obscure function of intercession. But the complete denial of Christ's divine nature renders this wholly abstract idea of doubtful utility as *praeparatio* for the Christian doctrine. It is rather in the Muslim's attitude toward Mohammed, a living and energizing loyalty, that we detect the soul's hunger for a mediator who shall be a High Priestly Intercessor. There is here without question an attitude of receptivity toward the need of a personal Saviour, which will prove of great importance once the traditional distrust of Christian Trinitarianism is broken down. It is sometimes said

[1] al Ghazzali.

that the Muslim deals directly with his God, and scorns any idea of a priesthood whatsoever. This is so in theory only. In practice, the veneration of local saints and prayers to them are only too regrettably prevalent and sincere; and the wistful, passionate dependence upon the personal leadership of Mohammed is everywhere a vital factor in Islamic life. From him they received the revelation; him Allah favoured above all men, even to the extent of exempting him from moral obligations required of others. Here they feel is a real mediator; the last and greatest of all the prophets, 'Al Rasul,' the one sent by God to them and for them.

This attitude is not to be ignored. It needs no words to prefigure the effect of transferring this reliance (a loyalty and sense of dependence felt by millions) from an Arabian warrior of dark passions and limited vision to the sinless, immortal Son of God and Son of Man for all time and for every place.

The Doctrine of the Trinity, as Experience

Islam worships no idol of clay. Allah is enthroned in the highest heaven, and He is a transcendental God. The problem of the Christian missionary is the reverse of his problem when confronting anthropomorphic paganism: the problem is not to show that God transcends the material universe, and is infinite, eternal and unchangeable; but to show that He is also *here*, that He has communion with man, that He is touched with the feeling of man's infirmities.

The question of the doctrine of the Trinity must be squarely faced. Some sincerely feel that, on the contrary, it should be avoided by the missionary, and with this we might agree were it a matter merely

of a philosophic definition of the Godhead. But to say this is to yield the field ; for the testimony of the Church rings through the centuries that it is through the Incarnation, and through the Comforter, that Christians have come to know God.

Islam's reply to the missionary is not simply that the doctrine of the Trinity is intellectually inacceptable ; it is not so simple as that. Its reply is that *God* is *unknowable*, and it is with the responsibility of leaving Muslims in *this* belief that we at our peril would slight the doctrine of the Trinity. With Muslims the Infinite comes to mean only the negation of the Finite. There is a popular jingle current in Cairo which tells a sad tale :

> ' Whatever conception your mind comes at,
> I tell you flat,
> God is *not* that.'

Islam is philosophically agnostic, and Revelation is only a formal and mechanical link between incompatibles. The orthodox position is that man may perceive certain of God's attributes (*sifa-t*) but he can never in any sense whatsoever know God's essential nature (*ẓat*). If some such idea may possibly be conceded for the Old Testament dispensation, the heart and substance of the New Testament dispensation is the revelation of God's *essential nature*, through the Incarnation, and through the effusion of the Holy Spirit, and so in the Holy Trinity ; and that these (experienced, not merely defined) are God in the human heart. The missionary cannot but preach the Trinity.

But practical work among Muslims brings out with tremendous significance the vital connection which should exist between high theology and life. Unless

these two are connected in the mind and life of the preacher, it is a useless task trying to improve the theology of the Muslim. The Unitarians give us valuable warning that the Trinity is not the *first* doctrine to be preached to Muslims ; rather the last. Their experience must lead them to it, or nothing will. It is by following our Lord like Peter, that they will of their own accord testify, ' Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God ' ; or by observing Him and His sacrifice that, like the centurion, they will comprehend : ' Truly, this was the Son of God.' For us, however, it is to be remembered, that they are not likely to arrive at an experience of God, unless we preach *and* experience the Trinity.

Contact with unitarian, deistic Islam forces the Christian to work out his theology *experientially.* Consider the Eastern Churches which so lamentably failed to stay or stem Islam. What is their key-note ? It is ' orthodoxy.' To the average Eastern Christian ' orthodoxy ' conveys a purely intellectual and metaphysical significance. If there be any ethical reality underlying the *filioque* controversy, it may reside just here, that the Eastern Churches thought only of the transcendental origin of the Holy Ghost, and left out of their creed the fact that, dispensationally, He is mediated to us ever, always, and only by the glorified Jesus Christ. The ' Catholic ' Churches of the West have shared this danger of considering the Trinity first and foremost transcendentally, and equally so have those Churches which vow allegiance to Calvin and Luther. Such an attitude is helpless against Islam.

Who can tell what moral results will accrue, when we allow the Trinity to dominate the devotional life of the heart, as well as our theology ? Who shall

gauge the debt we may yet have to confess to Islam, if that great antagonist prove finally to have compelled us to explore unknown depths of the riches of the revelation of the Triune God ?

The Incarnation and Atonement in Christ

In saying that the Christian message must ever centre in Christ, and in Christ crucified, the centre of gravity is not thereby made to fall outside God ; nor is the content of our last section negated, but rather confirmed : for Jesus Christ, and in particular Christ crucified, is the definitive projection of God upon the world of space and time.

The Gospel invites a man to begin with this projection, and straightway he will find himself transported into the heart of the Eternal God.

The imperfections of the Muslim theology will compel the Christian preacher to emphasize this Gospel message all the more earnestly. But these same imperfections should also cause him to make sure that his message of Christ crucified is spiritual and ethical through and through, and that it is ever addressed directly to the conscience, will and heart ; otherwise Incarnation, Atonement and Trinity will just be three more theologisms for intellectual assent, which would leave the life unchanged and the man unsaved. It is most healthy that Islam should drive us to this.

The cardinal mistake of Islam, as we have seen, and the cardinal point of difference between it and Christianity, is that the former conceives the relation between God and man to fall wholly within the physical category (with the result, of course, that it makes men things, not persons) ; while Christianity

insists that men are persons, and that the relation between them and their Creator must be fundamentally moral. The forces, therefore, which God exerts on man will not be purely physical in character, a contest of strength with strength; nor yet merely psychical, as though it were a contest between a strong intellect and a weak one; but *moral*. And from this spring profoundest differences between what Islam regards as befitting to Deity and what Christianity regards as such. Once master this fundamental difference and everything explains itself. In that which Muslim eyes regard as weakness, Christian eyes see power. What the Muslim admires as power seems to the Christian under certain circumstances to be sheer weakness—the weakness of the autocrat who displays physical force in a delicate moral case where it is utterly out of place. All these differences of view culminate in the Cross, which (rather than the Incarnation) is the battle ground between the two faiths. To the Muslim, as to the carnal Jew, the Cross is a blasphemy, the very embodiment of weakness and defeat; to the Christian it is the very symbol of moral strength and victory, and through it he has learned to say 'the weakness of God is stronger than men.'

In this work of Love and Redemption through suffering the Godhead is one—Father, Son and Spirit: '*God* so loved the World.' The Incarnation says, '*God was in Christ*'; the Atonement adds, '*reconciling man unto Himself*.'

The Atonement is thus seen to be a work springing from the very nature of God, not an external action which had to take place before God could forgive. We do not so much say: 'God could not forgive and save the sinner apart from the Atonement wrought

by Christ.' We rather say: 'None but a God who is so loving as to bear man's sin in eternity, and to bear it incarnate in time, could forgive and save the sinner.' The Atonement in Christ, of the Incarnate Son, is indeed the means whereby we attain salvation. But it is not an external means, an external plan, to enable God to do what His own nature could not do. It is rather, so to speak, an internal means, a transcript of the internal work in the heart of the Godhead, without which we could not have been saved. God, being as He is, could not but bear, could not but yearn, could not but be incarnate in His Word, could not but come into conflict with sin on the earthly stage in this Incarnate One, who as man suffered to the last possibility the action of sin in Himself—a death of agony in body and darkness in soul.

Nothing but perfect Holiness could have involved such cost as the Passion of God in eternity and in Christ. Nothing but perfect love could have borne it. Therefore, in the Cross holiness and love, wrath and pity, justice and mercy meet together and kiss one another.

The Character of Jesus of the Gospels

Much could be written concerning the need to correct Islam's distorted teaching about the earthly ministry of Jesus, which has been suggested in a previous section. But with respect to the character of Jesus, we must pause to note an opportunity and a challenge.

1. A challenge; because it is only our faulty presentation of the character of Christ that explains why the Muslim, while he allows to Jesus every

grace, seems to turn to Mohammed when he thinks of the attribute of strength. True, the category of physical force is a veritable obsession with Islam. Yet a doubt remains : has our portraiture here done violence to the divine original ? From any unworthy suspicion of weakness that Figure must be cleared. Its divine energy, exhaustless vigour and resistless power must be given their proper emphasis :—*Ecce vir !*—not the less, but all the more so because He was so perfectly gentle with little children ; so uncondescendingly courteous to women ; so understanding with the weak and the fallen ; and so tender in every relation of friendship and love ; *Ecce homo !* And the story of His Passion may not, and must not, be represented in the telling as feeble passivity. Rather must that one idea, insisted on by the master-hand which drew the picture in the Fourth Gospel, be insisted on also by us, namely, that through and in every detail He was royal and divine, proving in His own insulted body that the weakness of God is both more majestic and stronger than the strength of man ; *Ecce rex !* What in fact but very strength itself could have made and left His royalty the uppermost impression, after a night and a day of unresisted mishandling ? Can we allow the impression to rest with Muslims that strength is with Mohammed : the impetuous, vacillating victim of his own lust for power and for women, rather than with the Jesus of the Gospels whose purity, endurance and courage never faltered ?

2. An opportunity ; because the character of Jesus does attract the Muslim, an attraction which has been noted already as one of the most hopeful signs of awakening in many parts of the Islamic world. And there is one feature, especially, of the Gospel doctrine

which makes His leadership doubly attractive. The contrast between their dead Prophet, lying in his splendid tomb in al Medina, and the Christ who rose triumphant from the grave, and lives to make perpetual intercession, is found time after time to strike Muslims very forcibly. Many a simple man and woman has, even without definitely quitting Islam, found the sheet-anchor of a new life of faith in the one thought: 'The dead Prophet; the living Intercessor.'

Christian Prayer and Mysticism

In respect to devotional life, Christianity has too often failed to impress Islam, though it is precisely at this point that we should be able to contribute much. The paradox is a strange one, and most unfortunate: Muslims, worshipping an inscrutable God, are ever scrupulous to pay Him reverence; prayer is a sacred business not to be attempted without ablutions, executed according to a reverential ritual, with postures of awe, and with absolute concentration of attention. The chanting of the Quran and the Zikr is cultivated with elocutionary and rhythmic proficiency that takes years to attain. Christians, on the contrary, often seem to approach their God with less respect than they are accustomed to show in the presence of a government official. That we who profess to know God and to walk with Him, whose church treasuries are rich with mystic experience and glorious liturgy, should fail to make it appear that we delight to honour Him with every known resource of art and every true sign of awe and reverence, is a real tragedy; and, in the neighbourhood of critical Muslims, a costly one. Our services are too

frequently notable for slovenly or uninspired and uninspiring scripture-reading, the use of low-grade hymn music, sometimes more vulgar in quality than the melody of street-songs, and, on the part of the congregation, for irreverence in posture and attitude and painful lack of attention and concentration. In spite of all fear of ritualism, we shall nevertheless do well to hold fast to outward and spiritual reverence, even to the minutest detail in the externals of worship. Let us bring dignified and inspiring music from the West, or none at all. Let us seek for and use the best music of the Orient. Let us apprentice ourselves and our people to the art of reading the Scriptures in public with some of the beauty which the Muslim attains with his Quran. As for those who lead in prayer, let them not lead in public prayer if they have not prepared its spirit and its diction with searchings of the heart. When we have such a chance to show Muslims the secret of freedom and spirituality, combined with reverence and order, in public prayer, it is infinitely regrettable that we often give merely the impression of presumptuousness, slovenliness and irreverence.

The hold which mysticism has upon Muslims, and the reality of the part it plays in their religious life, cannot be exaggerated. The subject suggests that Christian mysticism should be more deeply studied with a view to seeing whether its message would not definitely appeal to those to whom the mystical element in religion is the most cherished of all. Of all the subjects which western missions and missionaries to Islam have as a whole solidly neglected, the knowledge of Christian and Islamic mysticism is the most notable, and possibly the most significant.

Christian Brotherhood

The brotherhood preached by our Lord in the Parable of the Good Samaritan is wholly unknown to the Muslim, to whom 'neighbour' and 'brother' do precisely mean—consciously, officially and admittedly—his co-religionist and him alone. That unique charter of a universal tenderness and serviceableness which Jesus gave in this parable has not been fully appreciated even by the followers of Christ; but the parable and the fraternity it sets forth are Christian because they are found in Christ, and non-Mohammedan because such a concept was simply beyond the mental and spiritual reach of Mohammed and of orthodox Islam. The Islamic fraternity, both as conceived and as practised, is narrow and intolerant. The Christian fraternity, so magnificently realized in the first centuries, is to-day broken to bits, but the ideal is still the only hope for humanity. We offer it to Muslims with absolute faith and confidence, acknowledging at the same time that Christendom has failed miserably to realize it in the modern world.

Let us not be blind to the disadvantage which Christian disunion places upon the Christian missionary to Islam. The failure of our religion to leaven western commercial and political life, its failure to leaven modern philosophy, are grievous hindrances to its reception in the East. The bitterness of war between 'Christian' nations is eloquent. The indescribably divided state of the Church, and the horrors for which the persecution of Christian by Christian has been responsible, are a real stumbling-block to the Muslim. Each little community, however insignificant, apparently ascribing to itself alone all orthodoxy, intensely

aloof and hostile to its neighbour; plural patriarchs for the same see, plural altars for the members of the Body while they live and plural graveyards for them when they die—even in death hugging their own isolations and elbowing each other out into the cold. What sights could be more pitifully ridiculous, if they were not such an utter shame? 'Become a Christian? What sort of Christian?' . . . 'Was your Christ born twice, and did He die twice?'—such are the questions which the Muslims ask.

We may as well let Islam alone unless we are prepared to offer to it and to the world a fraternity which is higher and nobler than the ghost of it which haunts the ruins of the City of God. It is no use merely to point with scorn to the bickerings of the sects at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The challenge comes straight to us in our own organizations to prove to Islam that the unity in Christ is to us more precious than denominational prestige—that to be 'reformed' is to have grasped, and to be living, the parable of the Good Samaritan. Failure here on the part of Protestants is more shameful, because less intelligible, than among the older Churches with their vested properties, their traditional jurisdictions and their organizations stiffened by tradition and hardened by isolation and oppression.

The level of Islamic fraternity is not an elevated one; compared with the level on which the mind and purpose of Jesus Christ worked it is a low one indeed. But it is a much higher one than the level of much of what passes for Christianity. We have nothing in the institutional Christianity of the West to approach the system of Islamic fraternity. We have only the *Spirit of Jesus*, the only asset of the Church. And, were Jesus but a lawgiver or an ideal philosopher

of the past, our despair must needs be complete. But just because He lives, Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day and for ever, then for ever is Christ greater than Christendom. Before we can win our Muslim brother to the fellowship of the Twelve with their Master, we must issue to Christians and to Christian missions the call ' Back to Christ ' ; back to Galilee and the parable of the Good Samaritan ; back to the charter of Catholicism inscribed under Mount Gerizim with one poor Samaritan woman as witness, and sealed under Mount Zion ' at a place called Calvary ' ; back to the revolution wrought in and by Paul and the apostolic band when Jewish exclusiveness was smashed through, when religious caste was finally broken, and the prophecy of Jesus to the Samaritan woman was realized in living form, and translated into the Catholic Apostolic Church ; back to the limitless brotherliness of the Spirit of Jesus.

Chastity and Family Life

The effects of Muslim sex morality and the consequent degradation of womanhood and family life have been often described, always with restraint. Those who live in Muslim lands know that the full unvarnished truth is usually unprintable. It is necessary here only to emphasize the fact that the conditions are far from being merely geographical, climatic or racial ; that Islam is directly respon sible for the entrenchment of unbridled sensualism, partly through its permissions, partly through its spirit and symbolism and partly through its confusion between legality and morality. It is incredible, were it not a fact (for example) how the typical erotic literature of Islam begins as a matter

of course with the time-honoured invocation of Allah and prayers for the Apostle of God. The sanction given by the Quran and Muslim law to slave-concubinage and unilateral divorce-rights is notorious. The sharp and early emphasis on sex within the Muslim home checks family life and love, and tends to produce a wrong sex bias and attitude. The segregations involved in the harem system create a homosexual atmosphere that leads all too often to homosexual vice.

In all the perplexities of the problem of sex, both social and individual, one thing stands out clear—that the incessant sounding of the sexual note in the Quran, the Traditions, the canon law, and in the poetry, literature, theology and entire system of Islam, tends to make impossible the highest individual, family or social life—unless, of course, under the influence of western ideals these things are ignored. In its attitude of man to woman, of woman to man, both primitive and historic Islam seem clearly to have missed both dignity and beauty, and to be far from having secured happiness; because it made woman in every way a prisoner of sex, till man came to regard her as the slave of his passions, instead of as the human partner of his life. In so doing, of course, Islam claims to have accommodated itself to the facts of human nature, and accuses Christianity of having sinned against human nature in commanding impossible renunciations. Such accusations may indeed lead Christianity to take stock of itself, and to see whether its true assertion of the paramount necessity of self-discipline may have led to negotiations and abnegations which are no part of the message of Him in whom the totality of human nature was sanctified.

But apart from the corrective of exaggerations of asceticism to which criticism may lead, the fact remains unshaken that the relation of man to woman and of woman to man which was made possible by Jesus Christ, is in truth the sanest as well as the purest, the strongest and the most perfectly human. The Spirit of Jesus teaches that the highest and the happiest solution of the sex problem in society is won by chivalry toward woman and by out-and-out acceptance of the subordination of impulse to self-discipline, and that this self-discipline *is* made possible by Jesus for whoever wills its possibility. We may confess penitently that corporate Christian fellowship is to-day less real than Islamic fellowship, but we may claim confidently for the Christian family throughout the centuries the contrast to Islam that is the contrast between light and darkness. Here, love has been brought to earth, and human relations have been refined and sanctified by the Spirit of Jesus. Here is and always will be an ungainsayable message to Islam.

By-Products of Christianity

Among the fruits of the Spirit most admired and needed in Islamic countries, the following deserve special attention :

1. *Dignity and freedom of womanhood.* The economic and social equality of woman with man.

2. *Dignity of labour.* Especially the service of the lowly by the 'upper' classes. (Community service in hospital, school and dispensary by Christian ladies is a revelation to Muslims.)

3. *Works of mercy.* The preciousness of the individual life; gratuitous medical, sanitary and

philanthropic services ; [1] unremunerated consecration of energy, time and money to the relief of the distress of total strangers.

4. *Ethical freedom.* Christian stress on character : the spirit instead of the letter of the moral law. Eternal principles of integrity instead of Islamic enslavement to obsolete social ordinances.

5. *Impetus to social progress.* Christian patronage of the arts and sciences ; the ideal of education and opportunity for all.

IV. CONCLUSION

Though our task has been purely expository, we cannot conclude without noting, with regard to the methods of missionary enterprises, the two central lessons derived from a comparison of Islam and Christianity in conflict :

The Spirit of Jesus

The justification of missions to Islam is not to be found in the superiority of western culture or theology or even morals, however genuine such superiority may be ; but rather in the fact that Islam is predominantly a religion of the letter, Christianity the religion of the spirit. But if so, then our religion, as preached to the Mohammedan, must indeed be a religion of the Spirit—of the ' Spirit of Jesus.' The phrase is pregnant to the last degree : not the manner of Jesus, not a ' spirit of service similar to His '—but ' The Spirit ' of God which

[1] Islam in the Middle Ages was, in cultural centres like Cairo, in advance of the Islam of later centuries in these matters. It is now re-learning the old lessons from the Christian West.

was in Him, and which through Him is the divine means of grace to-day. We have nothing else to give the Muslim unless we give this. Most futile, most disappointing and most foolish of all quests would be that which were only to seek to substitute for one ritual another, for one system another system, for observance of one series of ordinances another series. Christianity has always cut its most pitiful figure when seen trying to meet Islam with Islam's weapons, or competing with it on its own ground. Nothing but the Spirit can bind and free Islam. Let the Church that does not believe in the Holy Ghost save herself the trouble of attempting the conversion of Islam. The Spirit of the Father in Jesus Christ—we have nothing else to give Islam that is not corruptible : no, nothing.

A Spiritual Home for Converts

Missions hitherto have been the work of a corps of enthusiasts at home and abroad, rather than of the Church of Christ itself. The missionaries, howsoever they may identify themselves individually with native life, are still foreign : foreign by language, nationality and culture, above all foreign incurably in the identification of them as members of the western community which still exploits eastern rights and displays western greed and vice. The negative testimony rendered to Christianity in Muslim lands by secular Europeans and Americans has put the conversion of Islam by foreign missionaries alone almost beyond the reach of the imagination.

But even though every westerner in Muslim lands became an unofficial missionary, the battle would

still be unwon. There are steep barriers of colour and temperament that cannot be scaled successfully. And the problem of a real welcome to the Muslim convert, a welcome which would make him feel that he had found his real home, would still be unachieved.

The question which supremely matters is—'How far is the native Christian community, which we have raised up, a home for those who turn from Islam to Christ?' Oriental Christians must become the front-line missionary force, and the oriental church-community must become a home for those who find Christ. These two things constitute our supreme task, our highest ideal, our fairest hope. Only in nurseries of their own people can new-born souls thrive. This is especially true in a Muslim mission-land. The brotherhood of Islam, however imperfect, means much to those within. Since this is so, it is obvious that unless we can receive them with a brotherhood that is higher, better, more spiritual, warmer, in a word, *truer*, they will marvel how we have the face to preach to them at all. And contrariwise, a people so familiar with the idea of brotherhood will appreciate the real thing when they see it.

But the difficulties to be cleared away before the native congregations can act as missionary societies and as homes are very real. (1) The historic development of religious communities in the East has turned them into 'nationalities,' exclusive, suspicious of converts, antipathetic to neighbouring communities. (2) The age-long oppression of the Christian minorities by Islamic state authority, ever haughty and cruel, has made the native Christian shy of recruits from Islam. (3) Christian communities have been often disappointed by converts

who were insincere or unstable; till to-day it is a common experience to find native Christians who disbelieve utterly in the possibility of converting Muslims at all. While such an attitude lasts, we do wisely to expect few converts from Islam to Christianity—we do not deserve, we could not assimilate more than a few.

If this analysis be true, we who are building up native churches should concentrate attention on changing the thoughts which, for these valid historical reasons, have been warped too long. For thoughts are practical things; they are the mother of actions. While we, in our haste to act, perhaps call thoughts unpractical things, native Christian mothers are busy instilling the old thoughts, suspicions and prejudices into another generation of children, which will inevitably produce the old actions and attitudes, and deepen the chasm which separates the native Christian from his Muslim neighbour. We need on the field a *thought* campaign, such as has been waged successfully so many times in history. The great idea: '*My church as a home for Muslim converts*,' must inflame our oriental congregations with missionary zeal. How to light this flame throughout the Muslim world and to keep it burning should be our immediate concern. The result of this alone would make the Jerusalem meeting a turning-point in the enterprise of retrieving Islam for the Christ of God.

SECULAR CIVILIZATION AND THE CHRISTIAN TASK

RUFUS M. JONES, LL.D., D.D.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

NO student of the deeper problems of life can very well fail to see that the greatest rival of Christianity in the world to-day is not Mohammedanism, or Buddhism, or Hinduism, or Confucianism, but a world-wide secular way of life and interpretation of the nature of things.[1] Two-thirds of the entire population of the United States have no definite connexion or affiliation with any form of organized Christianity. If the one-third, which would be, roughly speaking, 37,000,000 Christians, were in every instance dedicated to Christ's way of life, the other two-thirds would soon feel the contagion of their spirit and the dynamic quality of their lives. But unfortunately a good many of those who compose the Christian third of the population are only nominal members of a church, and they reveal in their daily lives a large measure of satisfaction with, or even devotion to, what we are here calling 'secular civilization.' Rural centres of life which were once nurseries of religion and of high moral endeavour have undergone an ominous change.

[1] I am using 'secular' here to mean a way of life and an interpretation of life that include only the natural order of things and that do not find God, or a realm of spiritual reality, essential for life or thought.

There are still rural sections in which religious interest has been cultivated and where it remains virile and vital, but there are, on the other hand, whole townships in all parts of America in which there is no form of organized religion and where no adequate effort is made to interpret spiritual life to the little children born within the area.

There is no exact information available about the number of persons in Great Britain who do not belong to any organized form of Christianity. There are about 2,000,000 adult members of the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain. Relatively the same number of adults belong to the Free Churches. And not far from 4,000,000 belong to the Church of England. Making a generous count for the number of children belonging to each pair of adults, we should get between twenty and twenty-two millions of persons having some connexion with organized Christianity, so that more than half the population would be left outside all types of churches. Probably the actual situation is not very different in Great Britain from what it is in the United States, though the proportion of those affiliated in name with some church in the former country is perhaps greater than it is in the latter.

It is not possible to gather any reliable figures designating the number of persons on the Continent of Europe who are outside the church fold. The total number in all the countries of Europe, however, is beyond question a very large one. Ever since the time of the Deist movement in the eighteenth century and the revolutionary era that followed that movement, a very large proportion of the population of European countries have swung away from the Church and have accepted and adopted the secular

way of life.[1] They were familiar with, and habituated to, only one form of Christianity, and when that form ceased to have reality and meaning to them and lost its sway over their lives, they assumed that Christianity itself was outworn, and they gave themselves little concern to find what would seem to them a better and more adequate expression of the original ideal. They quietly adjusted themselves to a way of life which eliminated organized religion.

Russia has placed itself by official action definitely outside all Christian churches, and counts itself, as a nation, in the secular group. The leaders of the present régime declare the Christian religion to be 'the opiate of the people,' and they are devoted in their propaganda and educational systems to the task of secularizing the entire population of 140,000,000, though there are still large numbers of the Russian people, especially the peasants, who remain at heart loyal to the Church. It is even more difficult to express in figures the situation in missionary lands, but all who are observant travellers know that there are large numbers of men and women in all oriental countries who share in the main the way of life and the interpretation of nature which we are calling 'secular civilization.' The anti-religious Russian influence is strongly in evidence in student circles in China, and we shall in a later section of this paper see how widespread is the scientific mind, which implies the secular outlook, in all student groups in the Orient and in the Near

[1] There are, it should be added, a great many persons in all countries who do not affiliate themselves with any church, and who yet are profoundly religious. To be outside the Church by no means necessarily implies that a person is 'secular,' in the sense in which I am using the word.

East. The labour forces over the whole world are, in general, though of course not entirely, outside the fold of organized Christianity. They share the secular attitude and look to secular forces for the realization of their aims, and they help to constitute 'secular civilization.' A prominent speaker at the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order said: 'The world of men is slowly passing out of the churches.'

If we are to face clearly our present-day problems, and if we are to ask how successful Christianity has been in its conquest of the world, we are bound to make an intelligent study of this vast unconquered rival. This paper endeavours to set forth fairly and concisely what is meant by the vague phrase 'the world.' It will deal with that large fraction of humanity which makes no positive profession of faith in Christian teaching or in the distinctively Christian way of life. It will try to explain why there is such a fraction of society living in the midst of Christian lands, and it will aim to show as frankly and as impartially as possible the values of life and the springs of action that are the moving forces, at least in the better circles, of those who compose this type of society. The present author is concerned neither to 'level down' nor to 'level up' but to describe as accurately as one can 'what men and women live by.' It will help us somewhat at least to understand the situation, if we briefly review the stages through which this secular civilization has developed, and along with that development the gradual withdrawal, in some instances amounting to a 'revolt,' from the Church.

It is not true, of course, that the Church at any period of its history has ever really included, at all

events in a spiritual sense, the entire population of the area known as 'Christendom.' A French prelate who visited Rome during the papacy of Innocent III, at the end of the twelfth century, came back from the visible splendour disillusioned: 'I saw much that I was entirely dissatisfied with; everybody was so taken up with worldly and temporal affairs of politics and law, that it was hardly possible to speak or hear a single word on spiritual matters.' That situation is not confined to any one epoch. There has always been a wide unconcerned 'fringe' around the inner nucleus of the Church, which forms its real life, the Church within the Church. In the ages of faith the people who made up this vast 'fringe' had a loose normal connexion with the Church. They were not quite completely 'secular.' They turned to the Church in moments of extreme crisis and they thought of it vaguely as an ark of safety in a lost and ruined world, which some day they might need. They did not regard, at least not often, 'the secular world' as an adequate world, or one that could meet all the requirements of man's mysterious life. If nothing else turned their attention to the Church, the fear and dread of what lay beyond death drove them in serious moments to a dependence on the mediation, and 'good offices,' of this 'holy mother.'

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE RIFT

The rise of humanism marks the first widespread drift away from interest in and dependence on the ministrations of organized Christianity. At the same time men began to discover absorbing secular

interests that seemed to fill the whole horizon of life for them. In fact it was this discovery that the world itself was an absorbingly interesting world that caused the drift away from the Church as the centre of interest. It is impossible to put one's finger on the causes which produce great epochs of transition in human history. There are usually obvious and calculable influences at work. These can be noted and tabulated, but they do not furnish an adequate explanation of the 'new era.' The new era comes somewhat as a biological mutation does in the processes of life. It was unpredictable before it emerged and it is incapable of complete explanation after it arrives.

The recovery of the literature, philosophy and art of the ancient classical world was beyond question one of the factors that led to the humanistic movement. The Crusades opened a door to a new world. Europe came into contact with the creative work of the supreme geniuses of the past, and like the bones of the dead prophet, these life-giving creations awakened it to a new birth—*a renaissance.* But there were many other forces, more or less hidden, at work. The economic growth of the influential towns had already been producing a large number of rich families and an ever-increasing number of persons who were absorbed in commerce and material aims rather than in religion. An important middle class was growing up dependent on its own activities for the goods of life rather than on what the Church could do for it. Then simultaneously with the awakening, which came through the discovery of classical literature, came also the birth of national spirit and the swing of patriotism from the city as the centre to the nation as the unit of loyalty.

Behind this growth of nationalism which burst upon the different countries of Europe as a kind of mysterious birth was the more or less unconscious drive of economic interest and the necessity for a stronger protecting force for commerce than a single city could supply. In any case here were new human interests clamouring for scope and power. Other things than religion had begun to absorb man's thought. Life itself, here in the narrow domain of space and time, had become interesting in its own right. One's country was thought of as an ideal entity worth living for and even worth dying for. The appeal of business interest, the lure of wealth, the mysterious charm of pursuit, of risk and adventure for gain, had a fascination, a gripping power all its own. The Church slowly awoke to the discovery that it had a rival—in fact many rivals—but all of them reducible to one form or another of secular aims. Long before the birth of the scientific spirit the Church found itself confronted with a mighty competition that would not down, but rather kept all the time winning more followers who were sufficiently absorbed in secular ends of life to dispense with the immediate appeal of the Church.

Finally, out of the *mélange* of movements both secular and religious—social, economic, political, theological, ecclesiastical and personal—came an upheaval of major importance in the history of the race, the so-called Protestant Reformation, with its three main currents, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic and the common man's reformation, as expressed in the Anabaptists and the Spiritual Reformers of the sixteenth century. The important point for our present purpose is the tragic break of unity in Christendom. The western Church no longer presented a

solid front to the opposing 'world.' It was instead divided within itself into hostile groups. Christianity no longer meant some one definite and specific truth and goal of life. Each branch of it formulated its peculiar message in its own way and challenged all the other branches. Those outside of the Church looked on from a safe distance and saw only confusion and heard what seemed to them the jargon and babel of contentions. Wars of religion filled the historical stage for two centuries, and the impartial spectator could see in it all no living sign of the spirit of the gentle and loving Founder. Meanwhile the old-time authority of the Church had pretty much disappeared. There were too many claimants to the right of authority to give confidence in any one, and each claimant anathematized all the other claimants. Once more there was confusion worse confounded, and multitudes of persons chose to remain outside all the dividing fences while the claims of authority were being settled. The warfare of sects and schisms is without doubt one ground among many for the existence of large numbers of unchurched people in all Christian countries. Many of those who would naturally respond to the appeal of authority lose the force of that appeal amidst the confusion of tongues and the loud voices of the divided claimants.

III. THE EMERGENCE OF SCIENCE AS A RIVAL

The immense spread of the scientific interpretation of the universe has, however, proved to be the greatest of all the disintegrating influences in the field of religion. The great creators of the scientific method, Descartes, Kepler, Galileo and Newton, were distinctly religious men. They never dreamed that

their strictly mathematical interpretations of the universe could ever eliminate God. For them God was absolutely essential to the system of their thought as the Creator of the visible world and as the Founder of the mathematical laws by which the universe operated. They were not disturbed by a mechanistic universe, so long as it was taken for granted that it was a mechanism that God Himself had conceived, designed, ordered and set into motion in accordance with the mathematical laws of His own mind.

But gradually it occurred to the ' rationalizers ' of the eighteenth century that there could consistently be no interferences with the mechanistically ordered universe, no interruptions of its mathematical movements, no invasions or incursions into it from the outside. If God were to be admitted as the starter and planner of the cosmos, He must be conceived as above and beyond the entire system, and He could not be thought of as having ever interfered with the working of His perfect mechanism. Miracles could not, therefore, be admitted. If the universe is to be a ' rational ' system, no miraculous element could be allowed, even in Scripture. The Incarnation and the Resurrection must, like every other event, be interpreted in naturalistic terms. In fact religion must be reduced to ' natural religion.' One has only to scratch the surface of eighteenth-century thought to discover the havoc which this attempt to rationalize everything in heaven and earth played with organized Christianity. The movement for ' enlightenment ' passed on by gradual stages into deism, scepticism, and then with an easy step into atheism, for a God who is not needed to explain the present world was also thought not to be needed even as the ' starter ' of it.

No other century in the Christian era, except perhaps the tenth, has dropped to such a dull level of religious life as the eighteenth century did. Everything—art, poetry, religion, science, government, social life—was as far as possible reduced to a mechanical basis and was ordered by mathematical rules. There was an overweening confidence in 'rationalism,' and a universal fear of enthusiasm and emotion. The Methodist revival, the Evangelical movement, the birth of Pietism on the Continent and the unexpected wave of romanticism with its appeal to emotion and sentiment gradually of course melted the rigid ice and inaugurated a new spring—another renaissance of the world. But emotion and sentiment and romantic genius do not solve intellectual problems. The questions with which the rationalist eighteenth century had seriously grappled were still there to be solved, and the nineteenth century came back to them with renewed vigour and with vastly improved technique.

The area of the search, too, was immensely widened. The eighteenth century was primarily busy with the problems of the world machine in the sphere of astronomy and physics. The nineteenth century knew no limitation to its field of research. It essayed to apply the scientific method of mechanical explanation to the sphere of life as well as to that of masses of matter moving in space. New sciences of biology, anthropology, eugenics and psychology were born, and great areas that belonged to religion were newly brought over into the world of 'naturalism.' Astronomy, after the Copernican revolution, had already widened out the stretches of space to infinity. The world was no longer thought of as the centre of the universe, bounded and limited by

concentric series of crystalline domes above which was the heavenly domain where God and the redeemed souls dwelt. The world now became in the thought of these scientists only one tiny planet in a single solar system, surrounded by innumerable other similar systems, stretching off without end into the cold stellar spaces of a domeless and homeless universe. Geology and biology with their new methods of research pushed back the limits of time as astronomy had pushed back the skirts of space. Bishop Usher's chronology was revised backward with a vengeance. The origin of new species was explained, as all movements in space had been explained, in 'naturalistic' terms. Life was proved to be a developing, an evolving affair, and great progress was made in the discovery of the laws and methods of its evolution. Once more the expansion of the 'naturalistic' methods of explanation did not of necessity eliminate God, but it did to many minds tend to push Him farther and farther back and to turn over ever-wider areas of the universe to the operation of sheer 'naturalistic' forces. In any case the distinctly religious account of origins seemed to many minds to be weakened if not discounted.

On top of all this came the birth of new historical methods of research. These new historical methods proved to be so fruitful in the study of the development of Greece and Rome, of Egypt and Assyria, that they were bound sooner or later to be applied to the origin and development of Hebrew life and civilization. The books of the Bible were subjected to a most searching examination, technically called 'Higher Criticism,' as distinguished from textual criticism, which was called 'Lower Criticism.' This study soon convinced scholars that many of the books

of the Old Testament contained much earlier source-material. It seemed very evident to these scholars that the literature of the Old Testament revealed a long, slow religious development of a highly gifted race, and that the great prophets of Israel and Judah were the revealers of the marvellous spiritual conceptions of God, of life and of man's higher destiny.

Here once more the principle of development was brought into play and a large human factor was recognized in the most sacred books of the western world. The older conception of inspiration yielded, on the part of those who accepted these results, to a new way of thinking of revelation. The Gospels of the New Testament, the Book of Acts, and the Epistles of St Paul were searched with the same minute and scrutinizing care, and the entire New Testament was in time subjected to the same acid test of historical examination. No area was left in the known world marked off and recognized as too sacred to be put into the crucible of science. Everywhere process and development were discovered by the investigators. Everywhere the new methods of research resulted in a further extension of the human factor in the field of religion.

The leaders and interpreters of Christianity at first in very large proportion opposed the march of science and historical criticism. Pulpit and pamphlet and ponderous tomes sounded the alarm and formulated the lines of rebuttal. But science and historical research marched steadily forward. The schools and colleges and universities backed the scientific method and taught its conclusions. An ever-increasing number of students accepted the authoritative pronouncements of the laboratory and classroom, and where these conclusions conflicted

with the message from the pulpit, it was the pulpit that suffered. There came as a natural result a noticeable shift in the type of authority which prevailed. Formerly the prestige and sacred character of the Church with its inspired canon of Scriptures, its ancient creeds, its ordained priests, its mysterious sacraments, had produced a spell on men's minds and had carried conviction against all opposition. But for those who made up the student class nothing could withstand the new authority of facts, of demonstration, of laboratory evidence.[1]

Meantime the interpreters of religion yielded point after point in the contest, and from time to time drew up the lines of battle at a different battle-front, but all the time science and religion were in many essential points opposed the one to the other, and the student who accepted the conclusions of science was often made to feel that he had deserted the religion of his fathers and was an enemy to the true faith. Little by little vast numbers of the student class have accepted that challenge. They have thrown in their lot and given their vote on the side of demonstration, and have allowed the cause of organized religion to shift for itself without their aid or sympathy. Almost everywhere required attendance at college chapels has come under fire, and required courses in religious teaching have in many institutions become unpopular if not taboo. It is not in China alone that this situation prevails. It confronts as well many officers of those institutions of learning in the West which

[1] It should of course be noted that many devout Christian believers accepted the conclusions of science and historical research from the first, and in a great many instances became the leaders and exponents in the various lines of research and interpretation. That situation will be dealt with in a later section.

were founded by devoted Christians to be the centres of an uncontaminated religious culture. There is an ominous drift in educated circles and in educational centres away from the old-time interpretations of Christianity. Where the choice is sharply drawn between declarations of faith and demonstrations of the laboratory, the students of to-day in large numbers side with the laboratory. Where a possible hundred students will come to hear a lecture on the Christian conception of the Kingdom of God, a thousand will go with enthusiasm to listen to a lecture on atoms or an interpretation of behaviourism.

In spite of the fact that many educational institutions are still nominally Christian, it is undoubtedly true that education to-day has become profoundly secularized. The culture of the spirit, the adjustment of the soul to divine realities, the effective interpretation of the Galilean way of life have dropped far into the background, and a secular, naturalistic interpretation of the universe and of human life quite unmistakably occupies the foreground.

IV. VALUES OF LIFE IN NON-CHRISTIAN CIRCLES

Many of those who make up the total of the great population outside the churches do not, however, feel that they have dropped to a lower moral and spiritual level by their surrender of allegiance to the Church. In some instances they were forced out of the communions to which they once belonged and branded as ' heretics ' for their divergence in matters of belief. In other cases they have themselves become disillusioned, dissatisfied and more or less

rebellious toward the faith in which they were nurtured. More often the breach has occurred through a slow, gradual, almost unconscious drift from the old moorings. In a multitude of instances a high level of life has been maintained. There are beyond question beautiful lives in these groups. What Aristotle called cardinal virtues still abide in their lives and often shine with a clear lustre. No one can well doubt that religion has a far wider range than the dogmatist is willing to admit. There is ' an invisible Church ' as well as a visible one, and there are a great many persons who in their hearts and in their daily lives climb Sinais and even Calvaries, although their names are on no church register. We must be careful not to use the word ' religion ' or the word ' faith ' in too narrow and too exclusive a sense. The test is to be found, not in shibboleths and historic confessions, but in the fruits of the Spirit and in the quality of life and character. The organized forms and systems of religion do not contain all the piety, or all the truth, or all the goodness that exist. There are spiritual values of a high order, interpenetrating the secular ranks. Men and women live for high and noble ends of life outside the Church as well as inside it.

The atmosphere of love is beautiful wherever it appears. Grace and loveliness adorn many a home that has ceased to be linked up with the historic faiths. Business fidelity, integrity of character, loyalty to truth and honour, purity of life, faithfulness in friendship, sympathy for suffering and sacrifice for worthy ends are not confined to the area within the fold of the churches. The time is for ever past when the churchman can rightly maintain that all the saintly traits and all the marks of grace are re-

served alone for those who form 'the congregations of the faithful.'

We are not for the moment raising the question whether these spiritual values which exist within the area of the secular life are adequate for the deeper needs and for the complete development of the individual and the social group. We are only granting the undoubted fact that they do exist and that there are deep-lying forces of life operating in that region which the Church has been pleased to call 'the world.'

Perhaps there is no human value more universal in its appeal than the appreciation of beauty. Æsthetic enjoyment expands and enlarges life; in fact, opens it out into new dimensions. Beautiful objects bring a sense, almost a 'spell,' of the infinite; at least the beholder of the beautiful is not conscious of finite limits, but feels that he transcends the finite. Music, more often, perhaps, than any other æsthetic approach, frees life from the limits and the pressure of the finite and brings this time- and space-transcending joy. Æsthetic appreciation, certainly at its highest and best, seems to open a window from some spot of here and now into an eternal world, and to carry one beyond what the eyes see or the ears hear. The æsthetic method is much closer to the religious type of life than is the scientific method. Beauty is essentially a value, an appreciation, a way of life, a discovery of something that is as it ought to be. It turns the mind to realities taken as wholes, as integral unities. It is always an affair of the concrete.

Science, on the other hand, analyses, deals piecemeal with parts and elements. Its method is exposition, not valuation or appreciation. It tends to

end with the abstract and the general. Beauty, then, is like religion in that it is a value of life, an interpretation of worth, in that it elevates the spirit and in that it turns to the concrete rather than to the abstract for its joy and satisfaction. It has always been easy to make the value of beauty a substitute for religion, or to raise it into a religion itself. That happened in very noble ways in Greece. It happened, too, in the period of the Renaissance and it has happened again in our time. The cult of beauty is very widespread and very pervasive. Sometimes it carries its devotees to high spiritual levels of life and sometimes, of course, it does not. In any case, æsthetics has a subtle tendency to substitute an emotional state for a real achievement. It produces an exalted feeling, but it does not necessarily prompt to action. It does not discipline and control the springs of life. It does not construct a rightly fashioned will. It does not slowly train and mould the person to meet the stern temptations and the hard choices of life. Consequently the æsthetic temperament is not always robustly moral.

But the important point to keep clearly in mind is this, that vast numbers of people in all lands have turned to beauty—to music, to art, to the drama, to literature—for relief, for expansion, for spiritual stimulus, for joy and for satisfactory values of life. There are many teachers who find here in beauty the clearest and the fullest revelation of ultimate reality. They are satisfied so long as the universe produces and guarantees beauty. The æsthetic order is for them a divine order, immanent everywhere in the world, and their spirits rise in attitudes not unlike that of worship. The poets of the race, even when they have been conscious of no specific

religious mission, have again and again spoken to their age out of eternity and have spiritually ministered to man's deeper life in a way in which the priest was often unable to do. The Church is bound to recognize that these gifted interpreters of life have a real ministry for the world, and there is no question that they have to-day an immense following. The novel, too, and even the plebeian moving picture shows often take the place of the pulpit, and in so far as either of them is inspired with a genuine motive to purvey truth and reveal life it becomes a spiritual force, though it belongs on the secular side of the line.

The devotees and disciples of science also have a religion, and maintain, often on very high levels, those spiritual values which seem essential to anything like a complete life. Science gives its answers, in its own way, to most of the questions with which theology attempts to deal. The answers are different from those that are dear to the theologians. But they are honest answers. They are arrived at by careful and accurate methods. They are formed at least in ideal without personal prejudices or presuppositions, and they are in large measure free from the bias of dogmas that have been projected from eras of superstition.

Both science and theology have a cosmology—a theory of the universe—to offer, and the scientist is convinced that his cosmology is closer to the original ' pattern in the mount ' than is the cosmology of the theologian. The cosmology of the scientist, however, does not profess to give any ultimate answer to the problem of origins. It does not, and cannot, deal with an actual beginning. It starts with the universe as ' a going concern,' and then proceeds to describe the method and the principle of its processes. It

brings order and clarity into the vast congeries of things, the immense sweep of change and movement. If one is satisfied with causal explanations, with answers to the question : How does it all move and cohere and evolve ?—then science meets a deep human need. There are numerous persons who stop, and want to stop, there with these ' proximate ' answers. The profounder and more ultimate questions seem to them useless, futile and ' without reply.' They feel a genuine thrill of joy and wonder as they gather the pebbles of truth along the shore of the unexplored ocean that rolls out beyond the regions they have mapped. Very often they experience that exalted feeling that comes to a person in the presence of sublimity and mystery, and they frequently share what Spinoza called ' the intellectual love ' of the divine whole.

There is assuredly, at least in the case of the greatest of the scientists, a devout and truly religious spirit. The altar in the laboratory is different from the altar in the cathedral, but real incense and true sacrifice rise from both altars. The passion for truth which animates the high-minded scientist is often in shining contrast with the narrowness and bigotry of the purely dogmatic believer, who proposes to hold his position regardless of facts and of demonstrations. The spirit of patience in the pursuit of light, the dedication of a whole lifetime to the solution of some tiny mystery, rises often to the level of the saint's devotion. And the whole field of science is touched and glorified with the story of sacrificial consecration.

We can help one another best by cultivating the understanding mind, by recognizing all that is true and honourable and just and pure and lovely and of good report in each realm of culture, and by

endeavouring to appreciate everywhere the deeper motives of the human heart.

V. THE SYNTHESIS OF TRUTH THAT IS NEEDED

What ought to have happened long ago, and what must happen now as soon as possible, is that the leaders of the Church and the leaders of the Christian forces generally should joyously welcome all freshly discovered truth as from God, and should re-interpret Christianity in the light of all the truth that can be demonstrated as truth. That is what Clement of Alexandria insisted upon when Christianity was still young. ' Truth by whomsoever spoken,' he declared, ' is from God.' For him the great Greek philosophers were forerunners of Christ, as were the Hebrew prophets. In his mind there was no conflict between the demonstrations of knowledge and the testimony of faith, which is the assent of the soul to truths that for the moment transcend knowledge though they are essential for the whole of life.

In an even more striking way St Augustine brought over into Christianity the immense contribution of the Neo-Platonists of the third and fourth centuries. Instead of fighting these influential schools of Greece as rivals, he absorbed into his formulation of Christianity all that could be used in their systems for the richer interpretation of the faith of the Church. Dean Inge is quite right in insisting that historic Christianity is profoundly Platonic, and it can be shown that it was largely through St Augustine's genius that the Platonic stream came in full flood into the Christian stream. There can, I think, be

no question that Christianity was enriched by the process, and there is no doubt that multitudes of thoughtful persons were won to the Church by this absorption of the intellectual gains of Greece, which would have been lost to the Church and to the world if the lines had been sharply drawn and Neo-Platonism had remained a stubborn outside rival of Christianity—a hostile interpretation of life.

An even greater service was rendered by that remarkable genius of the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas. The works of Aristotle were discovered and brought into Europe at the close of the twelfth century. They were almost at once declared dangerous by the Church, and in 1209 and again in 1215 they were proscribed and forbidden to be read. But great Christian scholars found out by patient study that they had a very important contribution to make for the enrichment and expansion of the Christian faith, and Thomas Aquinas (1224–1274) devoted his superb genius to this task of interpretation. Instead of forcing the students of Aristotle into rivalry with the Church, St Thomas showed that there could be a fusion of Aristotelian thought with the basic conceptions of Christianity, and that the two together could meet the growing intellectual needs of the world. The Church gradually recognized the truth of the claim, and Aquinas wrought out his mighty system of thought which formed the intellectual basis of Dante's ' mediæval miracle of song ' and furnished a fundamental scheme of Christian thought until the modern world was born.

The most important single spiritual task before the religious world to-day is the discovery of a similar use of the present-day intellectual conquests of thought for the enrichment and expansion of our

Christian faith. To pit Christian faith against the onward march of science is to drive a wedge into the very centre of the structure of truth. It means a division of the forces which alone can build the new civilization for which we wait. It would make rivals of two currents of culture, both of which are needed for a complete and vital whole of life. For better or for worse, science has come to stay. It has won, as we have already seen, the allegiance of the institutions of learning almost everywhere in all lands. It has captured the minds of the thoughtful youth of to-day. They have lost their interest in a Christianity which sets itself into rivalry with the facts which science is discovering and verifying, or which insists on interpretations of life and thought out of harmony with those facts. This situation of rivalry in a very acute degree confronts the Christian missionary in Japan, China and India, where the institutions of higher learning, both secular and Christian, have accepted the scientific method of explanation. The students of these countries are at the present moment in a striking way under the spell of science. They pin their faith unreservedly to its method of explanation. They accept its conclusions with finality. Its authority overtops all other authority. In contrast with the truth of science, religion, whether native or foreign, seems to them deeply tinctured with superstition. The missionary who is unequipped with scientific knowledge and insight seems to them an inferior teacher, and he carries little weight or authority when he endeavours to speak to such students. I am inclined to think that there is no one thing that more impresses a man as he travels through country after country around the world

than the spell which science has thrown over the minds of youth to-day.

At the same time the way of life which Christ has revealed is so infinitely precious that it cannot be surrendered without giving up the priceless jewel of our souls. The central faiths of Christianity are realities by which men can live to-day as certainly as in the first century. They cannot be dropped without tragic and irreparable loss to the human race. We could quickly recover if we lost our warehouses, our railroads and our office buildings. We could come back to a new prosperity with most of our visible assets gone. But there is no substitute for these invisible assets which form the spiritual wealth and health of our souls.

There is a power, a saving and constructive force, in the eternal Gospel of Christ, which is more essential to the health and life of a nation than all its armaments and battleships, or even than all its means of transportation. We must not belittle the faith of the ages. We must not let any sweep of scientific thought blind us to the incomparable worth of that spiritual truth which constitutes our inheritance from Christ and the Fellowship of the saints. Our ultimate victory for the faith will certainly not come through surrender, or through a weak compromise of vital principles. The eternally precious treasure must be saved at all cost and kept for the life and health of coming generations.

With that point settled in our minds, we can boldly take up what I have called 'our most important spiritual task.' That does not mean the defeat, or the suppression, of science and criticism. It does not involve a proclamation to the leaders of research saying: 'Thus far shalt thou go and no

farther; here shall thy proud triumph come to a halt.' There is no end to investigation and question-asking. The returns are not all in, and they will not be all in while men like us remain on earth. We cannot limit the desire to know. We cannot issue 'bulls' against the fearless pursuit of facts or of truth. Our Christian task is a different one. It must consist in a fresh and living interpretation of our faith in the light of and by means of all discovered and verified truth through science or history. Professor A. N. Whitehead is right when he maintains that religion, in so far as it is made coherent and rational, is 'the wider reaction of men to the universe in which they find themselves.'

It is an immense undertaking. This process is a monumental task, like that of building the cathedrals of Europe, or constructing the creeds of Christendom, or reforming the Church in the sixteenth century. It will take the same kind of patience, perseverance, indomitable spirit, adventurous courage and constructive insight that pioneered the continent of America, won it for agriculture from the primeval forests and made it a land of plenty. It will not be easier than has been the creation of the immense systems of railroad lines, of banks, of telegraph and telephone networks by which the nations of the West have achieved and secured wealth and commercial prosperity. It could be successfully done if Christian leaders would go to work with the same patience, co-operation and marvellous devotion to truth that have characterized the men who have in the last quarter of a century discovered the internal nature of the atom and reinterpreted the structure and character of physical matter.

It should be recognized, of course, that there are many prominent and steadfast Christian believers and workers among scientists and among historical-research scholars. In fact the leaders and first-hand experts in these fields are probably no more ' secularized ' than are the men and women in the foremost ranks of any other pursuits of life. The cooling of faith and the drift away from religion are more apt to appear among those who are less tremendously in earnest than are the greatest leaders, and who have discovered enough to unsettle them but not enough to carry them through to a constructive basis of thought and life. But in any case those who are borne along in the sweep of scientific conclusions need more help, and a different kind of help, from the leaders of religious thought than they have yet received. Debate and argument and dogmatic assertion will not be enough. There must be a clear comprehension of the issues involved. An illuminating and convincing presentation of the spiritual basis of reality and of the Christian way of life must be given. This entire review of secular civilization makes the fact very evident that Christianity is confronted with a vast body of persons who exhibit rival interests and who are influenced by the appeal of values quite different from those which are expressed in and through the Church. These persons are largely impervious to warnings concerning the dangers that threaten their souls in the next world. They are cold toward the whole content of what is known as eschatology—the world beyond death. If they are to be reached and moved and transformed, it must be through an interpretation of life which raises it to a new dynamic quality, which increases its intrinsic richness and which opens out within the

man himself unsuspected interior dimensions of life. A keen-sighted, present-day prophet in the Far East has seen that men natively, naturally love Christ and want to follow Him when they really see Him in His true beauty and loveliness. He declares that the personality of Christ has everywhere an almost irresistible attraction. He declares that the Christ who has been overlaid with theological and ecclesiastical interpretations repels many of those who have formed their ideas and ideals in the atmosphere of the present time, whether in the home field or in the foreign field, but the Christ of Galilee and Gethsemane, the personal Christ of the evangelists, makes an instant appeal to their hearts and minds. 'The Christ of the Indian Road' is also, I believe, the Christ of the Chinese Road, and the Christ of the Philippine Road, and the Christ of the American Road. To see Him is to love Him.

There never was, I believe, a generation more eager for adventure than the one passing across the stage of life at the present moment. This spirit of adventure often carries men and women into absurd undertakings and sometimes sets them toward bizarre goals. But the spirit of adventure itself is in the main a great spirit. It merely needs direction and guidance. It needs to be shown an end worthy of the deep-lying inner urge. Let Christianity learn once more how to present the appeal of the abundant life, and men who die endeavouring to beat records of height in the air, or who defy the hazards of ocean flight, will with the same enthusiasm face the hardest perils for the sake of truth and goodness. We have tried to make the religion of Christ soft and easy. We have dangled before men's eyes the appeal of a sure reward. We have promised a *quid pro quo.*

We have cried, 'This way safety lies.' We have called the Church an Ark. But all the time the fact remains that real men are not seeking 'safety.' They want to discover how to live the fullest and completest life, and that always means risk and danger and the perilous edge. Let us present again now as at the first the Christian way of life as its own sufficient prize.

Above everything we must insist on a Christianity that stands first, last and all the time for the truth. In this respect, too, we must lose our fears. We have tried by far-fetched schemes and methods to safeguard 'our' truth, to hedge it about and to keep it insulated within its safe defences. We have thought of 'Christian' truth as something above and beyond 'truth in general,' as though there were levels and strata in the domain of truth. We must come to see that we gain nothing by insisting on private standards of truth and by setting apart our peculiar truths as though they belonged in a sphere where the normal tests of truth could be avoided or evaded. There is only one set of scales for truth, and our Christian claims to truth must be tested on those scales and must stand or fall by the way in which these claims conform to the eternal nature of things.

One hardly needs to say that if the secular-minded man of to-day is to be convinced of the higher spiritual values of Christianity, we who profess it as our faith must take its lofty ethical standards very seriously. The weakest spot in our Christian armour is our failure to live the life about which we talk and preach. Everybody admits without question or debate that the Galilean way of life is the most beautiful ideal that has yet been proposed. But Christianity cannot win the world by a reference to

the glory of a past epoch. It stands or falls, not by what it was in primitive vision, but by what it is in actual fact. We who profess it and who hope to propagate it are its supreme evidences. It is not the miracles of 2000 years ago that prove it now to this scientifically-minded age; it is the present miracle of spiritual grace and power triumphant in a human life that has all the effect of a laboratory experiment.

There must, further, be a profound re-interpretation of the central truths of Christianity to meet the new seekers in a new age. Some of the problems with which it is most urgent at this present time for Christian thinkers to deal constructively may be indicated as follows:

1. There is more confusion on the question of the spiritual capacities and possibilities of man's inner life—what would have been called a generation ago 'the nature of the soul'—than on any other single topic which is fundamental to religion. There is little point in discussing the more remote aspects of theological doctrine unless we can find some real ground in man's deepest ultimate being for that mighty experience we call religion. The battle with naturalism and mechanism is in the last grip to be fought out, not in the sky or in that dread region behind atoms, but in man's soul.

2. A great deal of the religious thinking in the past has consciously or unconsciously conceived of God as a Being above the sky, and that child-like attitude and sky-focus still dominate a large part of the phraseology, if not the actual thought, of Christendom. God is thought of as a 'Great Cause' of things, and thus He comes into rivalry and competition with the 'causes' which science describes. Here is another ground of confusion, and it will not be

easy to win our science-minded age until we learn how to interpret God so that He becomes a living reality with other functions than those of an ' architect ' of things or a ' starter ' of cosmic motion. It is an age ready to listen to nobler truths about God when some one has them to proclaim. People will generally listen to ' good news,' to a gospel, as soon as the ' good news ' comes with the note of reality.

3. There is much need of fresh light on the whole meaning of revelation, inspiration and authority in the sphere of religion. Ancient words and phrases are bandied about. Claims are made for infallibility and inerrant dictation. But with it all, pro and con, there is little deep thinking on the immensely important question of God's relation to us and the nature of His revelation of Himself through the ages. This question of course links up very closely with the first, i.e. the nature of the soul of man.

4. After all the age-long discussions of the nature of Christ, and all the formulations of doctrine about Him, in the stress of battle and controversy, there is still need of a simpler, a more intimate, a less controversial interpretation of this supreme Revealer of God and man. He ought not to be a storm-centre of controversy. He ought to be seen as a divine Lover and Leader of men and an Inspirer and Unifier of those who are seeking eternal life.

5. The meaning of the Kingdom of God still rests in confusion. If the Christians of any country were asked what Christ meant by this phrase, which was more often on His lips than any other, the answers would be variant and for the most part they would be feeble. In Christ's teaching it is something practical, demonstrable and charged with life and power. It could well be so interpreted as to carry

great weight to this practical and result-loving generation.

6. We need also to have a vital re-interpretation of the nature and function of the Church, and especially of the denominational families that compose it. The word ' church ' is to many scientific-minded persons a word of offence. It ought to be a word denoting friendship, fellowship and service.

This list of urgent questions and interpretations could easily be extended, but these are samples of tasks now before us, and we must not allow controversial differences to prevent us from facing them with courage and with creative power. These great issues of life can be approached, and should be approached, in the calm and impartial spirit which characterizes science. They are not questions which can be dealt with by scientific categories. They belong in a different sphere, but they can be studied with that well-known fidelity, sincerity, fair-mindedness and loyalty to truth which mark the best scientific work of our day.

VI. NATURALISM INADEQUATE

Meantime those who have adopted the scientific world-interpretation in terms of ' naturalism,' who find their way of thought irreconcilable with Christianity as they know it, and who consequently go on their way leaving Christianity on one side, are left with quite inadequate aims of life, and they plainly lack the dynamic and the inspiration which the noblest types of religion supply. Many scientists will, of course, not admit that. They will say that their devotion to research, their unselfish efforts to

promote the advancement of truth furnish them with the same spur and inspiration that comes from religion. They point with just pride to the fine quality of humanitarian spirit and the lofty moral integrity shown in the lives of non-religious scientists. All that can well be granted and has already been granted.

There is a certain spring of religion in the whole-souled high devotion to truth in any field. But those who have felt the fulness of joy that comes from personal faith in a personal God as interpreted in Christ, those who have found the immense dynamic of His undying love and have discovered the goal that opens before those who accept His way of life are convinced that the other spring is too thin and abstract for complete spiritual living, for moral health and holiness. Darwin and Huxley and Spencer in their serious moments confessed that they missed something. Many another scientist since their day has said so. Others have shown the lack even when they have not spoken it in words. Many of those who have maintained the lofty type of moral life unaided, as they believe, by religious faith, have had the great advantage of an early upbringing and nurture in a home redolent with faith and congenial to the formation of moral habits. It is not so certain that the second and third generations, reared without positive faith and the moral atmosphere of a religious home, will walk so softly or swing so steadily toward the guiding pole-star of life. In any case there is something in these human lives of ours which makes it impossible to get on adequately with the finite and the temporal. The infinite and the eternal are built into our inmost structure, and we cannot live a full, complete life within the limits and bounds of

what can be described and explained by antecedent causes. For life to be at its best there must be some kind of relation and response to the 'More than ourselves' and the 'More than the naturalistic universe'—a deeper reality in communion with us. When Christian interpreters learn how to speak with reality and power to that deeper inner need, which in very fact makes man 'incurably religious,' it will be possible to win the large and ever-growing group of science-minded people to the Christian way of life.

VII. OTHER SECULARIZING TENDENCIES

Besides this great section of humanity that has become 'secularized' in all lands through devotion to the method of explanation to which mechanistic science is committed, there is a still larger section that has accepted a secular way of life for other reasons and along other lines than those of scientific thought and research. One of the most striking by-products of scientific research has been the invention of machines for the application of the immense energies of the universe which the laboratories have discovered. These inventions and applications have completely revolutionized life and they have brought with them a new industrial era. The hidden resources of the earth have been uncovered and the inexhaustible forces of space have been harnessed to our mills and factories. We have passed from man-power, water-power and horse-power to steam-power, gasoline-power and electrical-power which have all the energies of the sun behind them. The industrial revolution has altered every aspect of life. It has produced a new stage of civilization. It has

affected social ideals as profoundly as it has coloured economic conceptions. It has touched and transformed the whole psychological structure of man's mind—his thoughts, his emotions, his dreams and his complexes.

We cannot expect religion to remain the same thing it was in the smaller and simpler world of man-power and horse-power. When life undergoes such a tremendous expansion and revolution, man's deepest attitudes and values are bound to be somewhat transformed. That has happened. The most obvious and striking effect of the machine age has been the expansion of city areas and city population. This expansion has come so gradually that it is easy to overlook the tragic results involved in it and to miss the secularizing forces that are hidden in it. Vast multitudes, including hosts of children, have lost their contacts with nature and with natural beauty. The thickly massed way of living alters almost every feature of life. The 'slum,' which is a product of this expansion, is positively unfavourable to family life, and it is so unchristian in its essential aspects that Christian living could not possibly flourish in it. But even outside and beyond the 'slums' in prosperous sections, there are many conditions that militate against Christian idealism and tend to disintegrate some of the age-long established institutions of family and religious life.

Problems of industry, of commercial success, of transportation, of expanding business, of capital and labour, of investments, of tariffs, of politics, have become much more alluring topics of interest than are theological speculations. Men who once would have been using their large intellectual powers to discover the right formulation of the doctrines

of the Church or to promote its ecclesiastical authority, are now absorbed in these vast secular interests which call for the whole of a man's capacities and endowments. Doors to fortunes open in all directions. The young person with drive and ingenuity can almost certainly become rich and successful if he gives undivided attention to his chosen aim—and he plunges into the roaring maelstrom of business and rivalry. It absorbs him and fascinates him and more or less possesses him. His religious interests fade out and die away because another competing interest has become dominant.

It is, furthermore, by no means easy to fit in Christian idealism and the aims of the Kingdom of God with the prevailing methods of present-day competitive industry, commerce or politics. The strain often seems too great. One or the other of the two 'rival interests' must be surrendered, and not seldom it is the Christian idealism that goes overboard. Or, as often happens, the business man has a fear of being a hypocrite or at least of being thought a hypocrite, and he cuts the knot by giving up his profession of Christianity to 'save his face,' as the Chinese say. More often, however, it is just the constant pressure and drive of business that gradually and unconsciously push all rival interests aside and capture the whole man. There is little time and less energy left for imponderable and invisible realities which seem likely to contribute nothing to the exchequer. The strain and tension of heavy responsibilities compel the worker to seek relief in sport and recreation, and before he knows it he finds himself caught in and carried along by currents which he did not suspect when he naïvely plunged in. It is all a complicated world,

and religion seems at first sight not to be an asset for success in it, or a necessity to provide relief from its strains and burdens.

Almost everybody likes to feel his native energies brought into play, his inherent capacities expanded, his potential powers drawn out and his natural gifts utilized. Whatever may prove to be the ultimate goal of life—the chief spur by which we live—there can be little doubt that the realization of our potential capacities is at least one aim common to all normal persons. We enjoy being carried forward by an unfolding plan that gives increasing scope for our deep-lying springs of action. Commerce, business, politics, management are interesting not merely because they lead to wealth or supply an adequate income, but because they give scope and opportunity for the expansion and realization of powers that push and strive unconsciously toward activity. The immense network and complicated tangle of secular life in the world to-day do not all have to do with the struggle for food and clothes and shelter. The 'acquisitive' aspect of life, the 'struggle-for-existence' feature of it, is only part of the story. Civilization is far more complicated than the bare necessities of life would demand. It represents, in part, the creative activity, the superfluous energies, of men and women engaged in the struggle to find the whole of themselves.

VIII. SECULARISM INADEQUATE

It would be all right if it worked completely, that is to say, if persons engaged in these pursuits actually did find 'the whole of themselves.' But it has

always proved impossible for beings dowered as we are to find the whole of ourselves in a purely secular world. The result at its best leaves much to be desired. It ends in failure, frustration and disillusionment. There are many fine traits revealed in the world of business, industry and politics. If we can forget for a moment the darker and seamier side, which our newspapers give us little chance to overlook, we might dwell, as we have done in an earlier section, with much satisfaction on the honour, trust and fidelity that mark a large part of the industrial activity of modern business. There is a good degree of loyalty to truth and righteousness, there is in operation a high code of honesty and honour and an unparalleled amount of generosity and humanitarian activity. There are on occasion splendid bursts of idealism, and there is a solid moral foundation underneath the structure of modern civilization.

But the 'darker side' of secular civilization is very much in evidence, and it is an ominous fact. Optimists may talk of 'cosmic progress' or the 'inevitable forward sweep of things.' They may dream of the universe as a kind of moving-stair—an escalator—that insistently 'goes up.' The cold facts of history silently refute this easy, rose-water view. Human 'progress' is not 'inevitable.' It depends essentially on the moral and spiritual co-operation of individuals and social groups. Blind cosmic forces do not push the world of men up into beauty, truth and goodness. These supreme realities of life are the fruit of dedicated spirits, co-operating with God. They do not flourish in a world absorbed in a rush for material gains or bent on quick ephemeral pleasures. Speed of travel,

utilization of material forces, conquest of the air by flight, discovery of radio vibration are no substitute for love and sacrifice, for insight and vision, for the experience of God and the enjoyment of fellowship with Him.

Even if we grant, as we may honestly do, a noble side to present-day secular civilization, it is impossible to overlook the affrighting vortex that lurks just below the surface of modern secular society. At the present stage of education and moral development it is not possible to make the world 'safe' for democracy or for any kind of sweet and wholesome living without moral and spiritual sanctions. The world will not be a safe place for little children to be born in unless mothers and fathers are loyal to something that transcends atomic matter, cosmic energy, business success and pleasure aims. The spiritual momentum from the religion of past generations will carry society on for a short period, but sooner or later there must come a profound religious awakening and a great revival of moral earnestness if disaster and collapse are to be avoided.

There are, it should be said, a great many persons who find a kind of religion in their altruistic aims and aspirations. Socialists, communists and reformers of society in general are often actuated by a passion for a new world, a better civilization. They find themselves more or less ostracized by the old, established order. They get little support from the churches, and they become detached from organized Christianity, while in many instances they become positively hostile to it. Dropping all connexion with the body of Christians that ought to be engaged in bringing in the Kingdom of God, they go their own way apart and find their religious fervour in their

social passion. Here, again, in spite of the moral glow and enthusiasm, the focus of attention is far too much upon economic and material forces, and there is a failure to discover those deeper forces that restore the soul and rebuild the individual unit of society. The civilization which we have been building is inadequate for man's life and for his complete spiritual health. The world of business and industry and secular aims starves and dries up the soul, even where it does not corrupt and defile. It is not possible to live up to the full height of man's potential being without drawing upon the deeper resources of the spirit. No civilization is 'safe' or adequate for the needs of the soul which does not draw upon the spiritual forces of the universe and weave them into its inmost warp and woof. Inventive skill, nimble cleverness and enthusiastic passion will not take the place in the social structure of faith in God and consecration to the spiritual ends of life.

IX. THE CALL FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP AND STATESMANSHIP

One more reason for the growing secularization of life in the world to-day is the widespread loss of faith—or, if not actual loss, at least the weakening of faith—in immortality. Of course it works both ways: some lose their faith in immortality because they are already 'secularized,' and others become 'secularized' because they have come to believe that this one world here and now in space and time is all the world there is to be surely counted on for them. It is not necessary for the purpose in hand to enter into any lengthy discussion of the influences that

have congealed this immemorial faith of the race in a continued life after death. The fact is beyond question. The passion for a life after death has waned with many persons, and where that is not the case the intellectual difficulties which beset the larger hope have seemed unsurmountable. The tendency to count on only what can be seen or proved or demonstrated has probably had more weight than any other single factor in producing the change of attitude.

In any case, that 'change of attitude' confronts the Church, and it means that the reconstruction of faith in immortality is a major problem of the hour. Until that reconstruction is accomplished there will inevitably be many who accept 'this one world' as all that really concerns them and who are therefore quite naturally secular-minded.

It must be admitted that the leanness and failure of modern civilization is in large measure due to the failure of the Church in the execution of its spiritual mission in the world. The 'secular' tendencies have gone on inside as well as outside the Church. The line of division cannot be sharply drawn at the door of the Church. It is not only non-churchmen who live by material results and who estimate and assess life in terms of pleasure gains. The watchmen on the walls have sometimes been asleep. The trumpet has frequently given an uncertain sound. The spiritual vision of the *curés* of souls has not always been clear and the moral leadership of the Church has not always been sound and virile.

Probably the greatest single weakness is the widespread failure of the Church to practise what it preaches, or rather, to practise the central message of the Gospel which it ought to be preaching. The

dark and gloomy pictures of sensational novelists, looking for interesting scandal-material, need not perhaps be taken too seriously. But such books are read by multitudes and they help to produce a general public impression of distrust. The more dangerous situation, however, is to be found in the tendency of Christian ministers to conform to the standards of the world and to be satisfied with an average of conventional morality and of spiritual boldness. Christianity is not a religion of averages and it does not flourish by guarding the doctrine of a golden mean. It lives and thrives only so long as its apostles and ministers are heroic adventurers, brave pioneers and are ready to go with their Leader the dangerous way of the Cross.

The confusion of denominationalism and sectarianism has played havoc in the work of spiritual leadership. This weakness is perhaps most apparent in the fields where Christianity comes into rivalry with the ethnic religions, but it is also very much in evidence in rural districts. Instead of massing the religious forces for the spiritualization of these communities, the rival churches have divided the neighbourhood into little party groups, often dominated by petty aims. Unimportant and secondary aspects of Christianity have been pushed to the front while the great appeal of life has been missed. The small denominational church with its tiny congregation has been unable to finance a large and constructive programme. It has often had to put up with a preacher who would accept a small and penurious salary and who frequently proved to be unable to reach and hold and lead the wisest and most thoughtful members of the community. Christianity in rural sections is at a low ebb and calls loudly for reforma-

tion and reconstruction. The ground has frequently been 'burnt over' with emotional revivals, but no profound and effective solution of the rural religious problem has yet been found.

What is true of country churches is in large measure true of churches in towns and cities. They have been weakened by their denominational emphasis and still more by their theological controversies. Both these points of stress tend to bring the focus of attention upon issues which do not concern the larger general public, and at the same time they turn the central interest of the churches themselves away from the main business of spiritual interpretation and leadership. The new problems which confront these churches in the complicated situation of the modern world would in any case call for the highest quality of prophetic insight and statesmanship in the leaders. But the constant playing up of smaller and more petty issues has often kept men of high calibre from entering the ministry and giving the churches that nobler leadership that is just now so greatly needed.

There have been some serious attempts made by many churches to 'socialize' the Gospel. They have tried the experiment of interpreting Christianity in economic and sociological terms and of applying it as practically as possible to meet the altered conditions of life. Where this has been done wisely and in the spirit of genuine love and human fellowship good results have followed. It has, however, been growing more and more evident each year that what the modern world needs most from the churches is an interpretation of life which will make spiritual ideals stand forth as real, and which will give Christ's way of life a fresh and convincing appeal to those who are confused about the actual goal and purpose of life.

In many cases, no doubt, that would call for the practical and social application of the Gospel, but in every case it would call for prophetic insight and spiritual statesmanship. The intellectual gains of the modern century must be drawn upon and used, as has been done in the crises and epochs of the past, for a more inclusive and a more convincing interpretation of the truth of the Gospel in its permanent and universal aspects. The world needs for to-day and to-morrow a great increase in the number of real experts in practical, experimental, applied Christianity. What is it men live by? What constitutes complete spiritual health and power, and how are they attained? These are questions everybody wants answered, and answered with wisdom and authority.

The crisis cannot be met by emotional revival methods, by the adoption of a more æsthetic ritual, by a return to ancient theology or by a dash of social experiment. It can be met only by penetrating the lives of the leaders of the churches with a real and dynamic experience of God. The scientist speaks with authority because his words are backed by the testimony of facts. The men of big business, too, are listened to as experts because their judgment is broad-based upon a profound experience in the matters about which they speak. The new type of church leader must in the same way be an expert in religion rather than a scribe trained in doctrines and denominational peculiarities. Wherever these prophets of the soul appear to-day men listen to them. It may be a materialistic age and it may be a generation given to the demonstrations of science, but it is a significant fact that even now all types of persons with all varieties of intellectual background

flock to hear a man who has this deeper experience of God and who can make the inmost realities of life and immortality clear and evident. The prophet still is listened to with rapt attention. The man who has been there does not lack for an audience in any community, and his books are the 'best sellers.'

X. MOBILIZATION OF SPIRITUAL FORCES

The conclusion is easy to draw. Much more attention must be given to the selection and training of the interpreters of Christianity, the leaders of the Church. There are men of the desired type in every college and university. If as much pains were taken in hand-picking them for the vital ministry of Christ as is taken in selecting football material for the big university teams in America, there would soon be a noticeable rise in quality. The Church must have the best men now living in the world. Its business is the greatest business of the age, and it must strike for and win the dynamic spiritual leaders wherever they show their heads in school or college. The hour has struck for the serious spiritual conquest of the world. The Church must meet the crisis with wisdom and with statesmanlike leadership. It cannot be done by a battle-cry or a 'slogan.' It calls for more than enthusiasm and dash. There must be a massing — a mobilization — of all the spiritual forces of the Church, and a deeply considered and carefully planned preparation for this conquest of the world.

At first sight it would seem that this one-world-level, secular civilization offers its votaries satis-

factory returns and rewards for faithful devotion. It is a world in which colossal fortunes can be and often are made by patient labour, or through happy chances quickly seized. Men tear down their little barns and build greater ones to hold their goods. Banks are crowded with wealth and warehouses are full of stocks. Fame and honour await persistent pursuit and honest endeavour. There are happy homes and merry hearths. Science has found out many secrets, learned how to cure many diseases, is on the way towards reducing poverty and is adding years to the ordinary span of life. It is evidently learning how to improve racial stock and is discovering some of the laws of eugenics.

At best, however, these returns of success are carefully selected out of a wide harvest where there are much tare and husk and chaff. There are many who toil and struggle and yet get no bigger barns after all their efforts. They occupy no safety vaults in the extensive banks for their surplus treasure, for they have none. Many have pursued fame and glory and have only empty hands and weary feet for their trouble. There are very unhappy homes and sadly broken hearts. After all the triumphs of science bodies wear out and break down and die, and will continue to do so when scientific skill is increased a thousandfold. Even if poverty were gradually decreased until it entirely disappeared from the economic world, unless something more than change from poverty to wealth happened, human society would still be weighed in spiritual scales and found wanting. There is an inherent element of frustration and futility involved in the very nature of the finite visible world. It is not enough—even if one had the whole of it—for beings like us. Many young persons

in recent times, confronted with the emptiness and inadequacy of the material universe, and convinced by their material creed that there is nothing more to be expected, have ended their lives in sheer disillusionment. It is not strange that they should do it. It is a kind of silent protest against the iron limitations of the secular life.

The Church has in its keeping a Gospel—a message of hope and 'good news.' It knows of a Kingdom of God to be realized among men and of an eternal life to complete the temporal one. It can meet frustration and futility with a way of life that transcends and overcomes the hollowness and the defeat. Its note is one of victory and its experts testify that they 'more than overcome.' How urgently then the secular world needs the experience and the message of a revivified Church!

XI. THE NEED OF A CONVINCING LABORATORY EXPERIMENT

There is no easy answer to this vastly complex situation. Each type of secular mind will need to be met on its own ground and to be approached with a fitting appeal. The main business at the present moment is to awaken the Church to the real issues that confront it and to call upon it to gird itself for the task. I shall confine myself in this section to a brief sketch of the attitude and the message that seem to me to be called for to meet the existing situation.

Nothing short of a convincing laboratory experiment of the transforming and creative power of Christianity can fully meet the condition of the

world to-day, either at home or abroad. There is no use selecting a few experts in talk to stand behind pulpits at home, or to go out with the title of missionary in foreign fields to expound in fine words a theoretical gospel of revelation or of salvation or of ideal societies, if most of the rest of us who are called Christians live by secular standards and practise a utilitarian creed with a thin veneer of church piety laid over it to soothe our consciences. Christianity cannot conquer the present world with any line of mere talk. Whenever there is a collapse of civilization through an excessive application of the method of strike or lock-out or through a drop down to the barbaric level of trench warfare and high explosives and poison gas, some one always reminds us that Christianity has not failed—it has only not yet been tried!

I insist that it has been tried and that it has worked gloriously. The only trouble is that the area of the experiment is too narrow, too limited. Too few have seen that a Christian is ' a new creation,' a person living in and by a new life-energy, and taking Christ's way of life seriously and sincerely. Too many have comfortably assumed that it was a religion of talk, a right formulation in words, a happy adjustment to hard facts of the world, of economy and of business, and a far-flung hope that in some way all may be well in the conditions that will exist after death. They have assumed that the Galilean road was not built for daily travel: still less was the way of the Cross to be actually walked by the rank and file of those who compose the churches. In other words, the conviction has not filtered down into the heart of the common man who makes up the Church that Christianity

is a religion of life, something we do, a daily walk, the practice of strenuous ideals, the building of a Kingdom of God here among men, an experiment of faith, a conquest of the world. The new missionary and just as truly the new 'gospeller' at home must become the leader of that kind of experiment. He must not only talk about living dangerously, he must actually live dangerously, as missionaries did in the days of the apostles and in the days when the seed of Christ was first planted in most of the foreign fields. We must, for one thing, as interpreters of Christ, be for ever done with gunboat Christianity and with aeroplane-bombing Christianity and with poison-gas Christianity. We must either stop talking about Christ's ideals of life, or go on talking about them in both word and deed, in the fell clutch of hard facts that may spell death to us, as He did and they did in whose train we want to follow. There is no other way to build a Christ-like world—no other way except to be Christ-like. We must meet this secular world—its prosperity, its smugness, its 'hard-boiled' philosophy, its utilitarian aims—with a settled conviction that we are going all the way through with Christ, and with a burning passion to be like Him in life and spirit—to be His, both to live and to die.

The 'experiment' will take many forms and there will be many varieties of it. It will rebuild the home as the centre of love and the nursery of souls. It will transform the unlovely sections in our modern cities and make them sweet, wholesome and beautiful. It will carry light and healing and spiritual life into the twilight zones at home, as well as spread with fervour the truth in foreign fields. It will once more recover for Christ the rural districts

where the daily food for the millions is raised. It will take pains to master the problems of nature and history with the same minute care and accuracy that now characterizes modern science and at the same time with spiritual insight and with a flood of light upon the deeper significance of life. It will bring a new revealing power into the ministry of the gospel. It will carry a reconciling spirit and a constructive wisdom into the complex problems of labour, business and industry. Here are adventures and conquests enough to challenge the spirit of youth and to give scope and range for the largest powers and capacities of our trained leaders. Once more, however, as in the greatest periods of the Church, the most important single contribution will be the preparation of a new type of saints whose beauty of consecration and whose radiance of life will overtop any logic of argument or persuasion of speech.

XII. THE NEED OF A COMPREHENSIVE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE

The next important thing—though a long distant next—will be our Christian message. The petty aspects, the futile controversies, the outworn survivals, must fall into the background or into the discard altogether, and we must focus on the everlasting substance, the eternal verities by which men live. We shall, I hope, be so greatly concerned over those things that are essential and vital that we shall no longer waste our energies and divide our spiritual forces in sectarian controversies and over denominational issues. Rivalries and party divisions have

had their day and must now give place to the wider spirit that comprehends with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height of the love of Christ. When we come to consider the 'eternal verities' by which the deepest life of man is fed, they prove to be few in number and they are simple, vital truths that find the individual at whatever level of culture he may have attained.

One of the darkest notes of our time is the seeming futility of a material system. One of the severest burdens men bear to-day is 'the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world.' Life interpreted in purely secular terms looks meaningless and devoid of purpose. On just this point the Gospel strikes its clearest note. It brings a vision of relief. It declares that a universe which has a Person like Christ in it cannot be through and through clanking matter. A love stronger than death triumphed in Him. Gentleness, tenderness, forgiveness, sacrifice, peace beyond understanding and joy in the face of defeat and death were controlling forces in His life. They are traits of the Spirit, not masses of matter in motion. Here, as nowhere else, another world, a spiritual universe, has broken in on this material system. Some One has come who could not possibly be a product of a universe of atoms and physical energies.

XIII. CHRIST'S SIGNIFICANCE FOR OUR DAY

I do not care for the moment whether we call Him a 'mutation' or a 'miracle': it is enough for me that some one came into the course of history and revealed in a personal life spiritual realities of a

most extraordinary type. Eternity broke into time, infinite qualities of life were revealed within the bounds and limits of personality, unimaginable grace found an organ of expression in Him. He was a radiant and at the same time an illuminating Person who made God mean more than He ever meant before, and who exhibited a new quality of life altogether. The easiest way to 'explain' Him, the most obvious way to interpret Him is to think of Him as a revealing-place for the eternal nature of things. When the electrical energies of the sun sweep through a balanced magnetic needle and swing it unerringly toward the pole star, we have more than a local event: we discover something absolute and universal about the nature of things. At a tiny point in space and time we know how the whole universe works in one aspect of its forces. So, too, in Christ we know something unique about the universe, something we could not know without Him. We know that at the heart of the mighty frame of things there is Love and Peace, Tenderness and Forgiveness like that! The deepest word is not matter, it is Grace. The movement of life is not toward futility and frustration, it is toward a new creation and the making of man in the image of Christ.

Man as yet is being made, and ere the crowning Age of ages,
Shall not æon after æon pass and touch him into shape?
All about him shadow still, but, while the races flower and fade,
Prophet eyes may catch a glory slowly gaining on the shade,
Till the peoples all are one, and all their voices blend in choric
Hallelujah to the Maker. 'It is finished. Man is made.'

As Christ shows here in our world the eternal nature and character of God, so, too, and in as unique

a way, He shows the divine possibilities of man. We are confronted all the time with the blunder and sin, the chaos and confusion of human life. We are only too familiar with man the failure. Every newspaper in its headlines shouts at us with a megaphone that miserable thing that man can become, and everywhere we can see the black splotches of his spilled ink. Sometimes we can hardly endure the world as it files by us in its mad rush for stupid and sordid ends. Once more we need a vision of relief. And Christ brings it to us. We see in Him what life can become when it is interpenetrated with inspiration, consecration, enthusiasm and love. He reveals man as truly and completely as He reveals God. The aged Simeon was right when, as he held the little Child in his arms, he said, 'In Him the thoughts of many hearts shall be revealed.'

He unveils our spiritual capacities to us as no one else does. He sounds us to our depths. He finds us at deeper levels than anybody else does. He revives and renews our self-respect. He awakens our faith in ourselves and our hope for a future that was unsuspected until we met Him. He discovers a possible self hidden within us, like a new name written on a white stone, and He stimulates the conviction in us that the possible self can become the real one. 'The making of man' is the very task to which He has put His hand. He comes to 'fulfil,' to complete, to realize the divine creative work. Other religions are not so much 'false' as they are inadequate and hampered by their limits. They lack dynamic and motive power, even where they do not fail in vision and in a goal of life. Christ is infinitely rich both in sweep of goal and in the release of power for attaining it.

The old phrases have lost their magic. Words that once were vital have gone ' dead ' from over-use or from cheapened use. The ground has been burnt over with the blaze of excessive emotion and sentimentalism. In zeal for ideas that were once both precious and effective there has been lack of growth and freshness in the truth. But Christ as Guide, Revealer and Saviour still goes on before us as of old. Research has not dimmed Him. Historical criticism has not reduced Him. Debate and discussion have not weakened His power or His attraction. We need to learn how to present Him freshly and vividly to a somewhat jaded and disillusioned world. Poise and peace, serenity and power are to be found in Him to-day as formerly was the case when those who were weary and heavy-laden, broken and distraught, were made every whit whole through faith and confidence in Him.

XIV. THE NEED OF A NEW CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH

It is the fashion at present to under-estimate the work and value of organized Christianity. On all sides we are told it is futile and impotent. Every institution which reveals defects is cried down to-day and belittled, even when not subjected to a ' revolt ' ; and there is no question that the Church has its quota of ' defects.' But once more we need a vision of relief and clarification of perspective. With all its benighted antiquities, its stock of shop-worn and second-hand goods, and its large proportion of timorous members and cautious leaders, the Church nevertheless is the most august and spiritually

effective body of persons on this planet. It has been in every century of its history, including the present one, an extraordinarily creative and transforming force. It has in every age changed water into wine, removed mountains, and made the fir tree and the balsam tree grow where once thorns and briars had flourished. There are more saints in the world to-day than in any other century. There are more happy, fragrant Christian homes than ever before. There are more persons, too, who live and work inspired by the consciousness of the real presence of Christ in their lives. In short, the continued life of Christ re-lived in and through men and women is a more impressive fact to-day than at any other time since Pentecost. The communion and procession of the Spirit are not words in a creed: they are demonstrated in every land and in almost every township of Christendom. If there is anything certain in this world it is that Christ is raised from the dead and is living now in myriads of triumphant and radiant lives. We need only to extend the conquest, to go farther in the direction in which we have started.

XV. THE NEED OF A FRESH VISION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

There has always been a tendency, a side-current, in Christian circles to postpone the Kingdom of God to some distant crisis. Sometimes it is the crisis of death. Sometimes it is the crisis of 'a second coming' of Christ. Here again we need a vision of relief. Death, no doubt, will be an event of first importance to each one of us, and it will have its own revelation to make to us. 'Second comings' have

been expected in every century since Christ, but they have not so far occurred as expected, and we need to be humble in our predictions. It is wiser meantime to focus attention upon one point which Christ made perfectly clear and which is capable of laboratory demonstration. He declared that the Kingdom of God was something that could be realized in men: 'It is in you,' He said. Whatever else it may be, and it can assuredly have many meanings and many fulfilments, it is a new spirit, a grace like Christ's, a sway of God within us, a second-mile adventure, an unlimited faith in love, and a practice of love all the way through to the uttermost. It is a kingdom that 'comes on earth' as fast and as far as God's will is done here as it is done in heaven. It is not a dream or a mirage; it is a fact already in some lives—in more perhaps than we suppose or have counted. It would come still faster and more impressively if we would take it seriously as an achievement to be ventured and realized rather than something to be postponed to some far-off future event. It is an inherent part of that divine and startling faith which made Christ such a unique leader of men and such an amazing builder of new worlds.

Some one once asked Abraham Lincoln how long a man's legs ought to be. 'They ought to be long enough,' the great President replied, 'to reach the ground.' Our Christian religion, if it is to conquer the secular world, if it is once again to 'overcome the world,' must be high enough to reach up to God and come into living contact with Him, and at the same time it must have its feet on the ground. It must be at the practical task of building the City of God down here where we live.

XVI. JERUSALEM, 1928

Go to Jerusalem, then, not as members of a Christian nation to convert other nations which are not Christian, but as Christians within a nation far too largely non-Christian, who face within their own borders the competition of a rival movement as powerful, as dangerous, as insidious as any of the great historic religions. We meet our fellow Christians in these other countries on terms of equality, as fellow workers engaged in a common task. More than this, we go as those who find in the other religions which secularism attacks, as it attacks Christianity, witnesses of man's need of God and allies in our quest of perfection. Gladly recognizing the good they contain, we bring to them the best that our religion has brought to us, that they may test it for themselves. We ask them to judge us not by what we have as yet made of our Christianity, but by that better and more perfect religion to which in the providence of God we believe our Master is leading us.

PART TWO

RECORDS OF DISCUSSIONS

AT THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL MEETING AT JERUSALEM, 1928

RECORDS OF DISCUSSIONS

THE DISCUSSION IN PLENARY SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL

ROBERT E. SPEER

I. INTRODUCTION

THE first two mornings of the Council's business sessions, Monday and Tuesday, 26th and 27th March, were given to the discussion of this theme. The papers which had been printed and distributed in advance were not read. It was assumed that they had previously been fully studied. The members of the Council had received also at one of the earlier meetings copies of unpublished papers from American, British and Continental groups, from the Swedish Missionary Council, and from the National Christian Council of Japan on the subjects under discussion. It had been arranged by the Committee of the Council that the discussions should be opened by Dr Speer and closed by the Bishop of Manchester, the joint Chairmen of the committee appointed to gather up the results of all the debates and to bring in a declaration for the consideration and adoption of the Council. In addition to the discussions by the Council in plenary sessions for these first two mornings, the afternoon sessions of these same days were devoted to section meetings in which those specially qualified to deal with each non-Christian system met to consider it and to prepare conclusions for the consideration of the committee.

It was felt by all that this subject of the Christian message was the central and crucial theme. There had been differences of view as to whether the method of approach represented in the printed papers had been the wise and true method. And the question had been raised as to whether the missionary forces were united as to the essential and fundamental elements of their message. Was any new and different Gospel proposed? The discussions and the later absolute unanimity of the Council's action in adopting the report of the committee on the Message gave a clear and conclusive answer. The debates, indeed, brought out rich diversities of thought but not antagonisms. And the final report represented, truly, a more expansive and comprehensive view than heretofore attained, but also a positive and unaltered tenacity of loyalty to the everlasting Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

It is to be regretted that the entire discussions cannot be published verbatim, but this cannot be done, and the purpose of this chapter is to present only an interpretative report, as full as possible, of the views laid before the Council, making use of the abstracts prepared by the Minute Secretaries, the Rev. J. S. Thomson of Scotland and the Rev. D. W. Lyon, D.D., of China.

II. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In opening the discussion, Dr Robert E. Speer, of the United States of America, said

that it was significant to note some of the differences between the meeting at Jerusalem and the Edinburgh Conference in the matter of the mode of approach to the subject proposed.

At Edinburgh the first business was the report of the commission on carrying the Gospel to the world, and it consisted of a survey of the fields yet to be occupied. The matter of the message was relegated to the fourth place. At this Conference it was now in the foreground. The topic at Edinburgh was the missionary message in relation to non-Christian religions. At Jerusalem there were two noticeable changes. It was the Christian message that was being discussed in relation to non-Christian systems. Another significant change was that a new word had been inserted. It was the Christian life and message that was being discussed in relation to the non-Christian systems. The word 'life' was significant and its warrant and meaning demanded reflection. Another noticeable change as compared with the Edinburgh Conference was that there was then no reference to the home-base aspect of the message, whereas to-day they realized that the whole subject of the message was of profound importance not only for the mission task in other lands, but for the home base also.

There were two very distinct aspects of the question: (1) Was there a Christian message for the world, and, if so, what was it? (2) What was the best method of the presentation of the message? There was a sense in which both these aspects were bound together and could not be separated, but there was another sense in which they were quite separate. A good deal of confusion of thought had arisen, in America at least, because these two aspects had not been adequately discriminated.

They were confronted to-day with the primary question, Is there a Christian message which is distinctive? The problem was as to the validity, sufficiency and authority of the Christian message. Was there any right or obligation to communicate this message to all the world? Among the churches there was a deep anxiety lest out of this Council there should come any weakening of the faith in such a right and obligation. They must make it clear that they had no wavering or uncertainty about this matter. They must make it clear that they had an unshakable conviction that they had in Christ a sufficient, absolute and final Saviour of mankind, a religion with unique values, with the divine idea of God and the world, and with an absolute unique and irreplaceable Personality in Christ.

Let them note the phraseology that was used in the subject—the relationship of the Christian life and message to non-Christian systems. There was a danger that their discussion might become theoretic and academic. The message of Christianity was not to systems, but to persons, to *men and women*, throughout the world.

He would lay special emphasis on the words 'and women.' The majority of missionaries were women. They were far away as yet from recognizing the place of women in the Church and the world, and they had to recognize that women had a very distinctive place. This was not an intellectual question, but one that was exceedingly practical. The real issues of life in the world to-day were in the hands of women, and the mothers of the world were shaping its life.

Another great change had taken place in the problem with which they had to deal. When they spoke of non-Christian systems they included systems which were irreligious and anti-religious as well as those of other religions than the Christian. In the realm of secular life there were great issues lying. They felt this in the whole home-base situation, and more and more they felt the truth of this right across the world. Dr Speer read a letter from a Chinese teacher :

'It seems to me that we have arrived at a stage in the history of missions when it is no longer worth while for the missionary leaders to study the Christian approaches to Buddhism, Confucianism, etc. The scientific study of these non-Christian religions will have historical and academic interest, but it has ceased to have the same practical importance in missionary work as it used to have up to twenty or even ten years ago. We must realize that the frontier of our missionary enterprise has changed, and with it we must also change the old tactics. Too much praise cannot be given to the growth in the study of comparative religions in the missionary training centres of the West. Thus prepared the missionary movement has been enabled to deal with the non-Christian more effectively. It is partly due to the educational activities of the Christian movement that the other religions are loosing the grip they had in non-Christian lands. While Christianity is making inroads into these religions from one side, these religions are suffering a great deal more in the rear from a group of new enemies, who have advanced so far into their territory, that, for all practical purposes, Chris-

tianity must ignore the incapacitated older religions and think of its frontier work in terms of what it will have to do with these same new forces: scientific agnosticism, materialistic determinism, political fascism and moral iconoclasm.'

It seemed to him that within a limited but enlarging area this was a very true diagnosis of the situation. It was not only against the background of non-Christian religions, but also against the new secularistic and naturalistic view that had spread across the world that they had to state their message. This was a battle not only for the missionary, but for the whole Church. They must call upon the scientists and the philosophers to take up the battle where the issue could no longer be evaded.

But they had also to realize that the missionary had a contribution to give. The contribution they had to give was not speculative but practical, by a demonstration of love and life and by witness to what had been given to the Church. However, it was necessary that they should realize that their problem was not entirely with educated unbelief, but was still mainly with the great masses, who were unshaken in their belief and practice in the old ways of life. They needed to remind themselves that it was persons with whom they had to deal and the great majority of these persons were still continuing in their old ways. This was particularly true of the womanhood of the world. The immense majority still presented them with the same old missionary problems.

A double question arose: (1) What are the essential enduring elements in Christianity? (2) How can the Christian message be adapted to the particular mind found in any one individual, race or period?

1. Primarily they grounded everything in our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. They called Him His religion. In all that they said they drew upon that root conception. Christ needed nothing from anybody. There could be no revelation of God displacing or supplementing the revelation in Him. How easy it was for them to fall asunder when they went beyond this. But they must agree in the truth that Christianity was based upon a great body of facts that were rooted in history and which could not be destroyed, which faith did not create and which unbelief could not destroy, and in the few great convictions which arose out of the personality and

redeeming work of Christ and that great body of moral and spiritual ideals and forces created and sustained by Him. And also Christianity gathered to itself a great body of men and women who were part of it as branches of the Vine and whose imperfections compromised and embarrassed it.

2. How was Christianity to be correctly represented to any individual or group of individuals or race? That was not a new question. It had been a great question from the beginning. There was no single formula that could answer it. Multitudes of men had gone over into Christianity because they had found in it the confirmation and enrichment of what was most of value in their own faith. Others, again, because of the radical and essential differences from their own faith. But there must be a communicable and coherent answer to the second question.

There were two other points with which he wished to deal.

There was to-day a great contraction of the world and closer human knowledge full both of understandings and of misunderstandings. A new body of moral estimates had been growing up in the world. The moral standards of Jesus had been increasing in authority and had produced new human judgments. A profound change was coming over all the non-Christian religions. This was due largely to the contact of Christianity with other religions, but also, in Turkey, to secularism, and there was increasing peril of the loss and destruction of the real truth and treasure in racial inheritance.

The peril was seen nowhere more vividly than in China. These old values would die unless they found themselves reborn in the security and consecration of Christ. In European life the old treasures of the past had been redeemed and baptized by Christianity. So to-day the old treasures could only live as they were cleansed and recovered in Christ, in whom there was all good and no darkness or shadow at all.

Lastly, their duty was not dubious. Their business was first to discern and to proclaim those elements in Christianity which were essential and universal and which were held in trust for all mankind. Secondly, to disentangle Christ from all that confused and obscured Him, from all that perplexed men needlessly, and thirdly to implicate Christ in realms in which He had not yet been implicated and which belonged to His lordship, and through which He could be known by the evidence of His healing and redeeming power.

Lastly, they had to express this message more vividly by love and power, by *word* and by *life*. Our Lord was the Incarnate Word, yet He also said, 'The words I speak unto you are Spirit and Life.' There was only loss and disaster ahead of them if they divorced Christianity as a way of life from Christianity as a message about God. Both conceptions were requisite. The only life that was Christian was one that carried the Christian message about God through a life of love and righteousness that was lived for Him in the world of men.

III. THE NEED OF A CLEARER AND MORE COMPREHENSIVE VIEW

Some of the deep issues of the question before the Council were at once opened up in an impressive statement by Dr H. Kraemer of Java, who said

that while he was standing there he was deeply solemnized and baffled by an intense feeling of utter inadequacy because they were discussing a very great subject which, to his mind, was an impossible subject. It was not, therefore, to be avoided but must be tackled. He also felt very baffled because in a very short space of time he had only the opportunity to throw out a few aphorisms. They were there first of all not to compare opinions but to think collectively about their message and their approach to other men on spiritual subjects. It was an impossible subject because missionaries were compelled to consider the relationship of the Christian message to non-Christian nations with a very weak background. They had a weak background because in Europe those who had the gift of the Gospel were themselves confused. They were in the birth-pangs of wrestling for a new view of life, the world—a *Weltanschauung*—and God. So long as they were in that condition it would remain an impossible task, however inevitable. Let them have no illusions about the results. They needed a prophet and thinker of the first rank. What hampered the missionaries was that they did not have a comprehensive view of life, but a set of detached dogmas (not using that word in the bad sense), because the West was nowadays devoid of a comprehensive view of life.

They were all wrestling for a new Christian view of life, the world and God, and so long as they could not find it neither the Church nor the missionaries could be quite clear about their message.

The meeting was not there to find a new Christianity, because Christianity in essence was a gift of God and not of their making. They needed a newly formulated and newly lived Christianity. They needed to become clear about some essential points. There were three essential points ; Christianity brought them a reality about God, about the world and about men :

1. God was the Creator and Redeemer of the world. On one side man was the most wretched and damnable of creatures and on the other side he had kinship with God.

2. The world was a creation of God which had become wretched and damnable, but which must become again God's world.

3. Christianity was the most paradoxical and the most matter-of-fact religion in this world. Paradoxical because it combined in real communion of life two opposites, ethically and ontologically, i.e., the Holy Personal God and sinful man. The symbol of this was the Cross in which the one line seemed to wipe out the other line but really completed it and consecrated the Divine solution of the deeper problem. It was matter-of-fact because it took into account the stern facts of life : sin, pain, disappointment and unrest.

They must find words which would be understood by men who were not believers in Christianity. One of the faults of the Church in the past had been that they had placed too exclusive emphasis upon the Cross and Reconciliation. Christianity had to find its central fact in the Resurrection. St Paul said that without the Resurrection all their preaching was vain. Even preaching about the Cross and Reconciliation was vain unless they were also glorious confessors of the Resurrection. The Resurrection was a deed of God in purely divine dimensions. The Cross was divine and human because it was impossible without the background of human wretchedness. The essence of Christianity was in the Resurrection. On the other hand our emphasis upon the Cross would thereby not become lessened, but rather would shine out more clearly.

The papers had stressed spiritual values. On the one hand that was not entirely good because their attention had been

drawn away from the central point of the Christian message. On the other hand it was useful because it would be a catastrophe if they should go away from Jerusalem with the impression that seeking for spiritual values in other religions did not matter. On the one hand the missionary ought to proclaim the glorious message of the Gospel ; on the other hand he must have an intense longing to discover the spiritual values in other religions. It was a matter for reproach that the science of comparative religion had been the first to give this to us. The missionaries needed to take this subject up because they were specialists in religion. The scientists were primarily specialists in science of religion, but the missionaries were specialists in religion, if they were missionaries at all.

IV. THE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE VALUES IN NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS

The broad general question which the preliminary papers had raised and which was, of course, obviously fundamental was the question of the right attitude of the missionary enterprise toward the non-Christian systems and especially toward the ' values ' of the non-Christian religions.

In General

On the main general question Dr A. K. Reischauer of Japan said :

Different attitudes were possible :

(1) The attitude of opposition which said that the Christian was right and all others were wrong. This attitude they could not accept, although there was an element in it which they must retain, because there were things in these other systems which they must condemn.

(2) The attitude of indifference. This position was that other religions need no longer be taken into account. They were worn out. There was some ground for this attitude, but it could no longer be held.

(3) The attitude of over-appreciation. This attitude had caused a good deal of trouble. There was too much reading in of a Christian content into other religions.

(4) The cold-blooded scientific attitude. This attitude had value and must have a place in their thought, but religion and spiritual values could not be examined in a cold-blooded scientific way.

(5) The attitude of sympathetic insight. They were willing to find truth wherever it was to be found. As Christians they could afford to be generous. They must not allow loyalty to Christ to blind them to what the Father had revealed to other peoples.

The more he studied non-Christian systems the more he found in them a reaching out towards the great things of the Gospel. Other peoples were seeking and we should take the standpoint of regarding them as seeking. Sakyamuni stood supreme among the great men of the East. Sakyamuni had nothing to say of God, but much of a moral law. He wanted to think of Sakyamuni as a child of God who did not know his Heavenly Father. He also thought of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, the centre of Whose message was the love of the Heavenly Father. They who knew God through Jesus Christ could go out into the world to seek for the children of God.

Canon Gould of Canada declared :

'There are a good many present who are fully prepared to acknowledge certain beauties of non-Christian faiths, but who dislike and dread the synthesis which we find present in some of the pamphlets submitted for our consideration.

'We dread this synthesis because of danger and confusion in these directions.

'1. Confusion between a recognizable similarity in form, and an essential difference in life involving the idea that this recognizable similarity in form is a dependable indication of a formative affinity in life.

'2. The danger of an extension of the synthesis from systems to founders or persons. In the region of systems we all recognize the existence of a reciprocal relationship between Christianity and some non-Christian faiths. We deny that this reciprocal relationship extends to the persons of their founders.

'3. Confusion in interpretation, in three directions :

'Firstly, in the minds of the general body of supporters. We must remember that every younger Church represented here to-day was founded by a body of believers in Christ, who sent out their missionaries to preach the old Gospel in the old way. Before we make any changes in those respects, we must be quite certain that conditions obtaining now are so radically and permanently different as to justify our action.

'Secondly, in the minds of our candidates for missionary service. If there is unrest and instability in this area we must be sure that it does not rise from a loss of conviction concerning the central verities of the Christian faith. Should the latter be the situation, then we must turn our first efforts to a conversion, in the realm of intellect and experience, of our rising generation.

'Thirdly, in the mind of the general body of the membership of the younger churches. We may recognize and define values to our own satisfaction, but our statement, if any, of those values will be sent out to the whole Christian and non-Christian world. There the interpretation placed upon them may be very different from ours and indeed harmful and dangerous.'

Professor Heim of Germany said

that he wished to lay stress upon the difficulties of the question they had to face. It was the remarkable progress made by this conference that they did not make any longer the distinction between the one true religion and all the other religions which were called false. But if that were so, then they were face to face with a serious problem. It was a question whether this mission work had not reached its end and something else had come to take its place, namely, a free discussion between all the leading spirits of all the religions of the earth about the spiritual values of the highest religious systems. They stood at cross-roads. There lay before them two ways : (1) To assert that all the different religions of the world were simply different expressions of the same mystic feelings and it did not matter which they chose ; if that were so, missionary work was finished. (2) To agree that missionary work was more urgent than ever before, and they must send their best

men to bring their message. If that were so, there must be something false in the non-Christian religions.

Many of them had tried to find a synthesis of these two ways by saying that the Christian was one who had gone further along the same road that others were travelling—Christianity was simply the higher climax of the same movement which they saw in all the non-Christian religions ; but that was no sufficient reason for missionary work. They could not demand such great sacrifices only to bring men a little further along the way which they were already travelling. To solve the questions they must combine paradoxically two points :

1. Every man was a creation of God and was therefore in relation to God—as St Paul said, ' in whom we live and move and have our being . . . we are also His offspring.' Even as Christians they must acknowledge fully the highest spiritual values in other religions and study them.

2. But they must not forget that all mankind had fallen and lost paradise, as the Bible taught. He did not say this in an orthodox, dogmatic sense, but as an expression of the present situation of every man towards God. They were all sons, but at the same time they were all prodigal sons who had left the Father's house. They were all longing for the Father, and all the religions of the world were forms of this longing. As prodigal sons they had to go back to the Father. But they could not go back by their own power. They could only go back if He came to them, and He came to them by the way of the atonement and resurrection of His Son. That commanded them to carry forth the missionary message at the present time.

The more specific question of the ' values ' of the non-Christian systems and our attitude toward these values was discussed by four speakers ; three from the Continent, the Rev. G. Simon and Professor D. Julius Richter of Germany, Provost M. Tarkkanen of Finland, and one from India, Dr Stanley Jones. Mr Simon said

that he wanted to make two points. First, that spiritua values were a presupposition of the whole discussion. The

Moslem knew all his own spiritual values. He did not need to be reminded of them, and if they continued to speak continually about the spiritual values in his religion, then he would be quite justified in asking why they were endeavouring to bring their religion to him. Secondly, the content of the Christian message was two-fold: (*a*) Repentance, i.e. a complete change of the inner heart. This meant that what was regarded as spiritual value before must now be counted as loss. As Paul said in his Epistle to the Philippians, 'What was gain is counted as loss for Christ.' (*b*) Reconciliation—reconciliation was the work of God Himself, and man was to be reconciled not by, but in spite of, his religious values. The Gospel was not a supplement to spiritual values in other religions, but the giving of new spiritual values to take the place of the old.

Professor Richter read the following statement:

'Some of my friends on the continent of Europe are perplexed by the tenor of most of the papers regarding the messages which have been presented to us. Their tenor is emphasizing the spiritual values in the non-Christian religions, and of course we do not in the least fail to acknowledge that there are such spiritual values in the non-Christian religions and we are the last to minimize them. In some cases it may even be an honourable task of the missionaries to open the eyes of the non-Christians to the religious values they have in their religions. Yet as a method of missionary approach this way seems to us of doubtful value. Most of us will be conscious of the great and threatening wave of syncretism which is approaching all the world over. Many non-Christians, particularly in India, are quite prepared to accept much Christian truth and to amalgamate it with their indigenous religion. There is a tendency even in some missionary circles to accentuate more the leavening influences of Christian civilization than direct conversions. This tendency is further strengthened by the so-called social gospel inviting all men of goodwill across the boundaries of different religions to a common warfare against the evils of the world. We agree that this warfare is indispensable and urgent, but in view of such tendencies we feel bound to emphasize our conviction, which we hope is general among all delegates, that evangelical

missions are based on the great and absolutely unique acts of God for the redemption of mankind, particularly the sending of His only begotten Son, His death on the Cross for the atonement of the world, His resurrection as the beginning of a new God-given life for the redeemed race. We are the messengers of God to proclaim this unique redemption which has not and cannot have any parallel in the non-Christian religions. We know that the great contribution of Christianity to the religious inheritance of the human race is this true and living God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the only way to approach Him is that faith which is willing to sacrifice even the spiritual values of non-Christian religions. We fear that the central task of missions is in danger of being lost to view by paralleling real or imaginary spiritual values, attractive though this method is for the professor of comparative religion. In view of the widespread confusion of religions and cultural currents in the modern world we consider it to be the urgent duty of the Church to stand decidedly and even stubbornly with both feet on this unique way of salvation proclaimed with one voice by the whole Bible.'

Provost M. Tarkkanen said :

'It is with trembling I have taken courage to say a few words about the Christian Message and ethnic religions, but I am by conscience compelled to do it.

'Surely we must follow the example of the great missionary St Paul and seek points of contact in the religious views which are held by the people to whom we are sent. Surely we must also acknowledge the light which the *logos spermatikos* has given to such great men as Zarathustra, Sakyamuni, Kungfutze and others. Like Balaam they have been prophets to their peoples, only more true to the truth and to their calling. Therefore I have with pleasure read much that is said in the introductory papers.

'But at the same time I have found in some of the papers views which I must think to be very harmful, especially to young missionaries. I humbly beg to point to some. With an appreciative understanding of the ethnic religions, I find a very uncertain tone about Christianity itself. We must never forget that there is no salvation in Hinduism or Buddhism, but only in Christ. Therefore Christianity is

not one of many religions, the highest and best perhaps ; it is something quite different from them all. The warnings against syncretism are very necessary these days.

'It is said that the missionary has to enter into partnership with the people of Asia in a great spiritual quest. This we cannot accept. If a man has not found the truth as it is in Christ, he simply ought not to go out as a missionary of Christ before he has got from Him a definite Message. There are in the Bible strong warnings against it. We have not to interpret Christ ; we have to testify what we have experienced and teach what He has commanded. We have to preach in His name no philosophies for the wise and learned but repentance and forgiveness of sins to all. This message is necessary for the Confucian Pharisee, who is satisfied with outward appearances and does not yet seek a pure heart. It is also needful for the Hindu who is seeking merit. The preaching of the forgiveness of sin through the blood of Christ will make sinners happy children of God and will give them life. It must also be wrong to talk much of Western and Eastern Christianity. If anybody has received Christ, his Christianity will be much the same in Europe and in Asia. To him who has found everlasting life in Christ, neither Buddhism nor Confucianism can give any new religious values.'

Dr Stanley Jones said

that there were two great issues before them in this subject: (1) Were there values in non-Christian systems worth conserving ? (2) Were there absolute values in Christianity ?

With regard to the first it was not a question for them whether they should recognize these values ; the question was, Were these values there ? If these values were there, then they must recognize them because they were Christians believing in truth. If they were to remain Christian they must recognize them if they were there. He was of opinion that there were values there. They could never overthrow a thing until they recognized the truth in it. He did not like the figure of building on non-Christian values. You cannot build on any other foundation but Christ. He wanted to change the figure. They did not want a syncretism. Syncretism combines ; eclecticism picks and chooses ; life assimilates. The question was raised as to whether Christ

was superior. He was not interested, because that question might be settled and it would not take us very far. The question was raised as to whether He was unique, but the real question was as to whether He was universal. If He was universal, He was superior and unique. What they wanted to know was whether they saw in Him the heart of the Father, the heart of reality.

He believed that in Christ they had absolute value, not a way of life but life itself. Jesus did not represent a religion, but religion.

The question had been raised as to what difference it would make to Gandhi should he become a Christian. He believed it would make much difference every way. It would satisfy the depths of his heart about God. He was not sure about God.

They wanted to combine two things, a sympathy and a certainty. They wanted a sympathy that would appreciate truth anywhere, and a certainty that in Jesus they had not merely the medicine of life or a way of life, but life itself. A sympathy that had no certainty of its own final value was weak, and a certainty that was dogmatic and blind to everything else was also weak. The really strong was a certainty combined with sympathy. In Christ they could have both.

A clear and comprehensive statement, correlating the conceptions of the uniqueness and universality of Christianity, was made by Canon O. C. Quick, who said

that the main problem before them was one of reconciling two aspects of Christian truth. The problem appeared to him to be that of reconciling the uniqueness of the Christian Gospel with its universality. In the preliminary papers the uniqueness had not been sufficiently brought out. The whole point was that the Christian Gospel was not one aspect of truth among others, because it was not ours at all. It was based on God's revelation of Himself to us. Our Gospel was based on the great act of God in Christ, and we could only make progress by going back to the great act of God in Christ. It was not even a question of the teaching of Christ being the fundamental thing. It was Christ Himself, and that included His teaching. They could not compare the

teaching of Jesus with the teaching of Buddha and arrive at the uniqueness in that way.

On the other hand there was the universality of the Gospel. The Gospel was like a strong light which was so strong that it found reflection of itself everywhere. Christ was the light that lighted every man. It was no cause for surprise to the Christian to find Him at work in lives outside organized Christianity.

Christian breadth of mind did not consist in saying, ' You have your truth and I have mine and there will be a synthesis later on.' The Christian said, ' I know whom I have believed and therefore I can recognize His work in non-Christian and secular systems.' The danger was that they might think of the uniqueness in the wrong way. They might do with other religions and secular movements what Marcion did with the Old Testament. Because the Old Testament was not Christian he failed to see the prophecy and reflection of Christ in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. They must be able to see Christ coming from Nazareth as well as from Bethlehem. Nazareth stood for all the unexpected places out of which Christ came. Having Christ and knowing Christ they were still to be learners of Him among the peoples to whom they went with the message. It was only to him that hath that it would be given. A man found a new thing in Christianity, only because he also recognized it as something for which he had already been seeking. The Christian Gospel must always be presented in relation to non-Christian thought. Christ had used the Jewish conception of the Kingdom of God in the proclamation of His message. St Paul had used some of the language of the Hellenic religions in his teaching to the Gentiles. The early fathers had brought the wealth of Plato, the schoolmen had brought Aristotle, and in its ages of creative thought Christianity had built on the non-Christian things that it had found. Other speakers had reminded them of the great day of Pentecost, and what they needed was the gift of tongues to make all men hear each in his own language the wonderful works of God. Thus they would attain to a clear vision of the uniqueness which proves itself by its universality.

During the discussions representatives of four great areas of non-Christian religion dealt with the whole

subject in its specific relations to Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam and the animism of Africa.

In Relation to Confucianism

Two speakers dealt with Confucianism : Dr Francis C. Wei of China said :

'Christianity is to fulfil Confucianism, not to destroy it. It has its distinct contributions to make to Confucian China. In the first place it gives Chinese morality a broader basis. The morality of Confucianism is largely based on the clan. Confucianism is fundamentally cultural and national, but morality must be universal, and Christianity will give the Chinese a basis for that.

'Secondly, Christianity will give Confucian morality a new soul. If we study carefully the Confucian moral tradition we shall find that its basis is naturalistic. Its central doctrine is harmony with nature, but nature as understood by the ancient Chinese years ago. Its highest goal is nature, impersonal and at its best pantheistic. To revivify Confucianism we must substitute the living God for impersonal and pantheistic nature.

'Finally, Christianity will give the Chinese a definite goal of the good life. Confucianism teaches its morality largely by examples, but its examples are either too dim or too fragmentary. What a change in the moral outlook of the Chinese it would be if we were to hold before them the supreme example of Jesus Christ both perfectly human and perfectly divine. The greatest virtue of the Confucian School is that of humanity; for the Confucianist, man is at his best when he is most human, but humanity is finally and supremely fulfilled in our Lord. Would it be possible for us to help the Chinese to realize the supreme humanity of Him who once trod the ground which we are now visiting ?'

And Professor T. C. Chao of Peking presented the following statement :

'I want to reaffirm two statements : First, I believe that the battlefield of Christianity in China is not in the realm of the non-Christian religions, but in the realm of secularism

and second, there is an urgent need for a change in the method of the presentation of our message in China. Under the present conditions of disturbance and change, people are trying to find a foundation for individual and social life. Under such circumstances Christianity has a great opportunity, and its task in presenting its message is, among other things, to fulfil the best that is in Confucian culture.

'In the first place, Confucianism in the broad sense of the word teaches us to show our gratitude to the sources of life, namely, nature and our ancestors. Men have their source of life in their ancestors, while all humanity has its source of being in nature. Man, being an organic part of nature, is considered the clear and explicit manifestation of the moral character of the Universe. Such an idea finds a complete fulfilment in the revelation of God as the fundamental reality of the Universe as revealed in Jesus Christ. The source and foundation of our being is that reality which as Jesus showed us is the personality of God. This is the distinctive contribution of Christianity to Confucianism.

'In the second place, it seems to me that Christianity in the life and death of Jesus Christ gives us a practical and needed solution of the problem of evil. This is true especially in the death of Jesus Christ. There is revealed in His Person a God of infinite love and almighty power. God is all-powerful in that He loves to the last and carries out without a change His moral programme. God is infinite in love as well as in power, in that He reveals Himself in Jesus Christ as a suffering God, a God suffering with human beings in their struggle against pain and sin. In Jesus Christ men found a realization of the forgiveness of sin through faith and the power to be and to do good. This thought we do not find in Confucian culture, yet it is something that the Confucianists need most.

'In the third place, there is a kind of personal fellowship with Confucius on the part of Confucianists. They admire and love the great teacher of the Chinese people, but this fellowship is only one-sided, subjective and without a living objective reality that would satisfy the real religious lines of the heart. This we find fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ, who is ever-loving, and who is not only the perfect ideal and example, but also a loving companion, friend and saviour.

'In the fourth place, we find in Confucianism emphasis on the self-culture of the individual. He is to be educated through more discipline for a higher and higher realization of his own powers for social good. He is to be an individual in order that he may take his place in the social order, and in the moral order of the universe. Therefore the human being is the most valuable thing in Confucianism, and yet in Confucianism we find there is no way to conserve the highest value that we find in the developed personality. This we find fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ, who having the most highly developed personality taught that life lived in His way is eternal. In immortality we find a fulfilment of our own life-culture in Jesus Christ.

'Lastly, we find in Confucianism the idea of a universa brotherhood, which is intellectually stated but not actually carried out, because of the lack of power and lack of a sufficient basis for its realization. But in Jesus Christ we find that this kingdom of God and universal brotherhood is realized in His person, as a kingdom which is not merely without in the world, but also within the human heart. This kingdom will extend its boundaries to include all humanity, and to be consummated in the final triumph of the good and true and beautiful. In this we find a fulfilment of our culture in Jesus Christ.'

In Relation to Hinduism

Four speakers dealt with the issues of the Christian Life and Message in relation to India. The first was Mr P. Chenchiah of Madras :

'I have felt there is an apprehension on the part of some of the earnest servants of Christ lest the method of seeking values in non-Christian religions should in some measure impair the integrity, absoluteness and supremacy of Christianity. To such as are oppressed with this, I would commend the new problem which is shaping itself in India, as the result of the contact of Christianity with Hinduism. The situation shortly put is this. While Christianity is challenging Hinduism at the base, Hinduism is challenging Christianity at the top. When we ask Hinduism what it has done for the depressed and down-trodden classes, Hinduism meets us with

the counter question, What have Christians to say to the finest fruit of Hindu religion and culture? It is not enough to assert that Christ is unique. We should be able to say wherein He is unique that the world may see and appreciate it. Non-Christian religions have ceased to be the opponents of Christianity but like secular science have become the competitors of Christianity. This is the great change in the religious situation that has occurred since the Edinburgh Conference. To this change the Christian method and message should adapt itself.

'Every Christian young man who has ventured into Hinduism with the message of Christ is coming back home with the conviction that there is something great, transcendently great, in Jesus, which we have missed. Hinduism bids the Christian to uncover the deepest element in Jesus. The power of Christ which the Church manifests is a power which Hinduism feels is available within itself. Have we saints? So has Hinduism. Have we men at peace with God? So have they. Have we men who fight for righteousness? So have they also. Above goodness and greatness and religious power, above the ideals of the human heart and the power of human effort, there is a new creative energy which Christ has brought, which is to be the vehicle of a new earth and a new heaven. This power Hinduism wants. Not till we uncover this power will Christ attract the saints and sinners of Hinduism. The Hindu does not want a way of life, but life; not the preaching about Christ, but Christ. If you have Christ, pass Him on. If you have the Holy Spirit, give it.

'In a sincere and earnest way Hinduism asks the wise men of Christendom what Herod asked of them, "Go, and search *diligently* for the young child, and when you have found Him, bring me word, that I may come and worship Him also."'

Professor E. Ahmad Shah of Lucknow said

that the Christian message to the East and particularly to India had been given in the presentation of Jesus as a teacher. Through the press (i.e. through books, pamphlets, newspapers) Jesus was continually presented as a teacher. The Indian mind which had emphasized the approach to God through knowledge had appreciated Jesus as a teacher and there the Indian mind had stuck. He did not despise this attempt

to present Jesus. It had been noble, but it must not be the final message for India. The Indian mind has not yet recognized Jesus as a personal Saviour.

He would earnestly plead that those who went to India should live the teaching of Jesus in their lives so that the eyes of India might be turned to Him to find Him as a personal living Saviour.

Mr K. T. Paul of India said

that he wanted to speak about the barriers in the minds of the best Hindus to the Christian message. There were certain Hindus who came to a situation in which they were very powerfully attracted by Christ, but did not feel justified in changing from one community to another. He wanted to look at this question not from the intellectual but from the practical point of view. He gave the example of a student who came to Christ in the best of ways, through a missionary or through the homes of Christian people at home or abroad. His first and perhaps most difficult barrier was due to political and economic conditions in India that had been created by the West. But Mr Paul did not wish more than to mention this, for even if all the contacts of the West were thoroughly Christian that would not remove all the barriers. There would still be something deeper. It arose out of the strength of Indian culture, which strength was not adequately realized abroad.

Mr Paul sympathized with the impatience of the great apostle to the Gentiles with the Judaizers because he had a vision of something bigger, whereas they thought they knew all about it. He desired Christ to dominate India because Christ and Christ alone could dominate Indian culture and yet not destroy it. Nothing western could ever do it. He was impressed with the sublimity of Indian religious philosophy and with the depth and sincerity of Indian religious life as he met it in Hinduism to-day, so much so that he craved that India might come under the dominion of Christ who alone fulfilled and did not destroy. He lost patience with cataloguing superiority and inferiority of values. The living Christ was sufficient if He was left alone with India, interpreted, of course, through human life and relationships.

The great testimony to this was in the fact that the work of

Christ in India was carried on not only through the forces of organized Christianity, but equally vitally and in a more widespread measure through the forces outside organized Christianity. Therefore it was necessary for missions to be fellow-workers with Christ both inside and outside of organized Christianity.

Principal John Mackenzie of Bombay also emphasized the social problem as greater than the intellectual. He held

that it was no new Gospel they had to present. But let them count it possible that they might be mistaken when they thought that the Gospel included all the wrappings with which they had encased it. There were many parts of India in which the Gospel was making an impression in ways that they had not expected.

In the student life of Western India the greatest enemy was not Hinduism but secularism. Many students had shed the old ways of life and had found nothing to take their place. He would rather have the man who bowed down to a daub of red paint upon a stone than the materialist. There were others who had shed a great deal that belonged to the old faith, who looked up to God as Father. All this had come to them through Christ although they did not recognize that fact.

But the greatest barrier to the acceptance of Jesus Christ was not intellectual but social. The Hindus were enmeshed in a great web of social custom, every part of which had a religious sanction. It was impossible for many of them to become Christians, because they were not prepared to break with this great social system. There were in the student community many who in their hearts believed in Christ, who were prevented from becoming members of the Christian Church by the tremendous social upheaval that such a change involved. They were accordingly doing a great Christian service by joining with Indian people in all activities that had as their end the purifying and liberalizing of social life. There were no short cuts to the realization of the kingdom of God ; and as a preparation for the kingdom it was their duty to help the Hindu people to rid themselves of every incubus that hindered them from coming to Christ.

In Relation to Animism

The only speakers who dealt with the Christian Message in relation to Africa were the Rev. A. W. Wilkie of the Gold Coast and M. le Pasteur D. Couve of France: Dr Wilkie drew attention to the fact that there was no paper relating to the non-Christian systems in Africa.

He did not make any complaint of that because they had had an opportunity to discuss these problems at Le Zoute. But Africa could not be shut out of their hearts. They must think of the way in which the whole message of Jesus Christ could be brought to such a people as the Africans. It was not true to speak of animism as a system. It was an attitude towards life that issued in a way of life. It was an attitude which recognized that there are things beyond that which we can see and touch and handle, that there is a spirit in and through everything. It was not an 'ism,' but an attitude of life which had gripped every soul in the bush—every woman by her sick child, propitiating the evil spirits that were trying to take the child away—it grips every fisherman upon the sea, every farmer sowing his crop. It was a way of life that had brought terrible fear.

Jesus Christ had answered the needs of this people. Sometimes they were supercilious about what Africa had to teach them. He always thought of Jesus Christ. When His disciples were wrangling about who should be the greatest, Christ did not rebuke them, but he set a little child in their midst and said, 'Except ye become as little children ye cannot see the kingdom of God.' That was what their African brothers were teaching them, the simplicity of the faith of little children.

Their African brothers had learnt the mind of Christ as they had never done. He thought of such men as Aggrey, Moton, Max Yergan, who had ruled hate out of their lives. He was shamed to the dust when he met them. They had every reason for hatred and resentment, but they had taken up the cross not with glum but with smiling faces.

M. le Pasteur Couve said

that there could be no Christian love which had no *respect* for other religions. He had the deepest respect for the humblest African. Africans were looking constantly to the great unseen world, a world far greater than the poor little world in which they lived, that world which was also more permanent. The African needed a gospel which was the gospel of the unseen and eternal. He was afraid that our Christianity had lately become a Christianity of this world. They seemed to believe that Christianity was able to transform the world and make it beautiful. Their gospel had become a gospel of pragmatism, a gospel of progress, but the most marvellous of their works of achievement was nothing compared with the life of Christ put into the heart of a man.

They were speaking too much of Jesus as a companion. He is so certainly, but they needed to speak first of Jesus as a Saviour, not for this world which does not last, but for eternity. They must take care when they saw the evils of civilization that they were not tempted to believe that they were able to compensate those evils with the fruits of Christianity.

In Relation to Islam

This recognition of eternity and immortality in eternity, Dr Zwemer emphasized in dealing with the Message of Christianity to Islam :

'The human heart hungers for the eternal and the infinite. Men believe in immortality because of the intrinsic incompleteness of the present life, because they have observed that character often grows even when the faculties begin to decline, and because of the imperative clamour of our affections. Love is stronger than death. Something within us echoes to this Voice of the Universe and souls are drawn forward irresistibly on this one path to their eternal home.

'Not one of the non-Christian religions (with the possible exception of one form of Buddhism) teaches annihilation. None believe that death ends all. Most of them, but especially Islam, emphasize that what takes place after death is supreme and decides the eternal destiny of the soul. Although the

eschatology of Islam is vitiated by crass ideas of the terrors of the tomb, the process of resurrection, the carnal nature of the Paradise promised to believers, and the pit of the ungodly, the belief in a future life is real and universal. Mohammed was a preacher of the Apocalypse. The day of account when heaven and earth would stand stripped before the Judge of all, this laid hold of his imagination. The climax of the short creed of six articles on the lips of every Moslem is everlasting life (Al ba'ath ba'd al Maut). Early tradition has written its elaborate commentary on Mohammed's eschatology, with eager skill describing heaven and hell, the Bridge, the Scales, the Pool, the Tree of Life, and the Tree of eternal death (Zakkum) in lurid colours. One of the best sellers on the bookstalls in the world of Islam is the manual entitled *Daqa'iq-ul-Akhbar fi'l-Janati wa'n-nar* (Accurate Facts on Heaven and Hell). It has been translated into all the leading vernaculars and is known everywhere.

'We say, "The Moslem faces the Future" and "Young Islam is on trek," and then proceed to describe sundry social, economic and political events on the near horizon. But the sincere Moslem has ever had a wider horizon and faces the future a great way off. He is on trek to the far country. This world is a stage or market-place passed by the pilgrims on their way to the next. The world is like a table spread for successive relays of guests who come and go. Life is like a lamp the light of which falls upon the walls wherever it goes. The heart is the wick of this lamp, and when the supply of oil is cut off the lamp dies. But this is only the death of the animal soul; the second soul is spiritual and eternal. Death is not an interruption but a connecting link, a door that opens upon the hidden realities. As al Ghazzali expresses it, "Men are now asleep; when they die they wake up." What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his Paradise? is a question the mystics have often proposed to the worldly and the heedless of their day.

'The burial rites and the funeral service of Islam deeply impress the sympathetic observer. The face of the dying is turned toward Mecca. At the last breath those present say reverently, "Verily we belong to Allah and to Him do we return." The washing of the body, the grave clothes, the burial procession and chant, the prayers offered, the shape of the grave and the instructions read to the corpse before the

visit of the angels of the tomb—all this when rightly understood is a compelling argument for missions. Because our Moslem brethren see the invisible world, hear inaudible voices, and try to lay hold of intangible realities they will never be attracted by a missionary message that is not other-worldly. The Moslem knows that Jesus raised the dead. The story of Lazarus, referred to in the Koran, is enlarged in their traditions. It was at the grave of Lazarus that Jesus preached the gospel of the Resurrection. "I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." This was also the heart of Paul's message. He preached Christ and the Resurrection. He knew no other gospel. "Now, brothers, I would have you know the gospel I once preached to you, the gospel you received, the gospel in which you have your footing, the gospel by which you are saved—provided you adhere to my statement of it—unless indeed your faith was all haphazard. First and foremost, I passed on to you what I had myself received, namely, that Christ died for our sins, as the scriptures had said, that he was buried, that he rose on the third day as the scriptures had said . . . If Christ did not rise, then our preaching has gone for nothing, and your faith has gone for nothing too. Besides, we are detected bearing false witness to God by affirming of him that he raised Christ—whom he did not raise, if after all dead men never rise" (1 Cor. xv. 1–4, 14, 15, Moffatt's version). We must stress in our preaching to Moslems this very heart of our message. Jesus was victor over death. There is no terror of the tomb. He, not Mohammed, has brought life and immortality to light in the gospel. If in this life only we had hope in Christ, our message and we ourselves would be most miserable. But we are ambassadors of the Conqueror of death, the immortal King of Glory. Our gospel for the Moslem concerns eternity and is therefore of infinite value. All our institutions, organizations, equipment and methods are only a means to an end—the scaffolding for the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

'The social gospel has its place and its power: Islam needs to understand the ethical content of the gospel message and its severe demands; but nothing can so appeal to the individual as the gospel of the resurrection. There is no aspect

of our message more timely than this. Indeed we are progressives in theology if we carry this message to the non-Christian world. As Dr Deissmann told the delegates at Lausanne, " For the last thirty years or so the discernment of the eschatological character of the Gospel of Jesus has more and more come to the front in international Christian theology. I regard this as one of the greatest steps forward that theological inquiry has ever achieved. We to-day must lay the strongest possible stress upon the eschatological character of the gospel which it is the practical business of the Church to proclaim : namely, that we must daily focus our minds upon the fact that the Kingdom of God is near, that God with His unconditioned sovereignty comes through judgment and redemption, and that we have to prepare ourselves inwardly for the *Maranatha*—the Lord cometh."

' This indeed is our missionary message, the everlasting Gospel of One Who came, Who died, Who rose, Who ascended, and Who is coming again. From Bethlehem and Calvary, from the empty tomb, and from the clouds that hide Him from view there streams the light of eternity.

' Because God " hath set eternity in their heart " (Eccles. iii. 11) " We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen : for the things which are seen are temporal ; but the things which are not seen are eternal " (2 Cor. iv. 18). The gospel of the resurrection is alike the token of our apostleship and the test of our sincerity in the world of Islam. If we fail here, will not Moslems, as well as

> The angels from their throne on high
> Look down on us with wondering eye,
> That where we are but passing guests
> We build such strong and solid nests ;
> But where we hope to dwell for aye
> We scarce take heed a stone to lay ? '

V. SYNCRETISM

A central question, as this account of the discussion indicates, was the question of ' syncretism ' in religion. Professor W. E. Hocking of Harvard

University, who again and again contributed helpfully to the Council meeting, said

that he would like to offer a simple remark on the subject of 'syncretism'; for here the experience of philosophy and religion had much in common.

In philosophy one dreaded eclecticism, a patchwork of ideas that do not belong together. He sympathized with those who hated syncretism in religion; mere syncretism has no charter of life in it. But there was a form of hospitality to the experience and thought of religions other than our own which was not mere syncretism, and which was demanded by the new situation in the world of thought to-day.

The new situation was brought about by the fact that there was a world philosophy which was spreading itself by no teaching nor missionary effort, but by its own power as an accompaniment of industrial civilization. They might call it scientific materialism or naturalism. It appeared as something opposed to all religion, but it was important to recognize that historically it was the offspring of Christianity. It came from a freedom of thought for which Christianity had fought; without free thought there could be no free men. When it gained control of government (as in Russia, Mexico, Turkey) it commonly brought with it some institutions which had their ancestry in Christianity, some elements of concern for the masses, education, emancipation for women.

The universal spread of this type of philosophy required a new alignment of religious forces, a recognition of alliance with whatever was of the true substance of religion everywhere. They had to recognize not only that this type of philosophy was becoming universal but also that a world religion existed. They gave religious systems separate names, but they were not separate; they were not detached globules. They merged in the universal human faith in the Divine Being. Unless this was recognized the problem was mis-stated.

The thing feared in syncretism was a loss of personal identity. In making friends, we imported into ourselves something of the quality of the other person; yet it never occurred to us to fear loss of personal identity. So in appreciative contact with other religions Christianity need have no fear of loss of its own identity. And there were three further reasons which were requiring this openness to other systems:

1. Christianity must speak the language and use the conceptions of other religions, in order to be understood.

2. No man's religion was sound unless it was in some sense the religion of his fathers ; he who worshipped needed to join his ancestors in worship. Worship of ancestors was one thing ; worship with ancestors was another, and might interpret the first.

3. Our own conceptions of religious truth needed to be enlarged and ripened.

The Kingdom of Heaven was like leaven hidden in a measure of meal. The leaven mixed with the meal could no longer be distinguished. It was 'hidden,' but there was no fear that its life would be lost. Let them hide religion in the measure of the world's meal, knowing that the result would be an enlarged and truer conception of their own religion.

VI. WOMAN AND THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE

No clearer testimony to the uniqueness and indispensableness of Christianity was given than came from the women members of the Council. Three of these spoke for three sections of the non-Christian areas. The first was Miss P. S. Tseng of China, who said :

'Confucius made only two direct statements concerning women. One was, "It is very difficult to keep company with women or small-minded men, because if one is too familiar with them they lose their respect, if too far from them they grumble." The other was a comment on what King Wu had said to the effect that he had ten persons to keep his kingdom in order ; Confucius said that these were only nine, because one of the ten was a woman.

'Perhaps it is because Confucius said so little about the position of women that the later Confucian schools have an anti-feminine strain in their teaching. This reached its highest point in the Sung dynasty. Since then Confucianism has affected the women in China not in a progressive way but has rather set them back in three respects :

'1. In domestic life. The Chinese woman has no status in her own home according to the teachings of the Confucian school. At home she must obey her father; when married, her husband; and after the death of her husband, her son. It therefore leaves no room for woman to develop or to express her own individuality. She must sink her own personality into that of her men-folk.

'2. In social life. The Chinese woman has no social activities, and she does not take any interest in public affairs, because the Confucian scholars do not approve of women meddling with such things.

'3. In intellectual life. We have a proverb in China, "The ignorance of a woman is her virtue." From this we can see that women have very little intellectual training. It is true that Confucius did not forbid women from being educated; nor did he emphasize the point.

'Perhaps one of the reasons why China is in her present state is because we have neglected our women for so long. No nation can rise above its women. We cannot have a strong nation physically or morally when half of its population is lagging behind and is ignorant of the great factors of life.

'The Confucian message, therefore, is not enough for China, because it touches only half of the nation. The Chinese women can find full life only in the message of Christ, who was born of a woman, revealed His Messiahship to a woman, and showed His glorified body after His resurrection to a woman. In Christ there is no distinction between men and women, and He has set the same moral standard for both sexes. Christ has given woman life, soul and the way to come to God. In Christ the women of China will find their right position, not only as citizens of China, but as citizens of the Christian world.'

Miss Tseng was followed by Mrs Kubushiro of Japan, who said in substance:

In Japan no religion, native or imported, except Christianity, had ever given woman the place of a person in its full and real sense in Japanese life. The seed which Christianity had already sown had begun to bear fruit in a fuller recognition of the worth of woman, but the larger fruitage was yet to be realized.

Miss H. K. Kim spoke in behalf of women in Korea :

' The secular system of life in Korea, influenced largely by the teachings of Confucius, fully recognizes the instrumental value of women in the maintenance of home and society. But only when the life and message of Christ were brought to Korea did the women find themselves to have intrinsic values. Christ has shown clearly both in His life and in His teachings that to God one human personality, whether it be man's or woman's, bond or freeman's, is just as valuable as any other. Christian young women, and men as well, of Korea have learned this lesson and are diligently seeking to apply this teaching consistently in their lives.

' When Christ taught the way of life to the Samaritan woman at the well, He withheld no privileges and made no conditions as to her right to bear witness to Him. The same was true of His attitude to men and women of all classes. But His life and teachings seemed to have been misrepresented since, perhaps unconsciously and in some cases with good intentions, and we find to-day certain conditions even in churches under Christ's name that make the vision of Christ a little blurred to the less discerning eyes of youth. For example, while Christ has never forbidden any to bear witness for Him, in some churches of to-day women are not allowed to preach in pulpits, not because they are lacking in ability or in zeal, but just because they are women.

' I think Christ would pity us women, if we still are timid and hesitate about bearing witness to Him in all the walks of life, not only in domestic life, but also in the industrial, commercial, political and international life of humanity. I think He would say to us, " Women, have not I freed you ? Why are you still so timid ? Go forth courageously with my message into all the phases of human life. They need you there, and there you have a distinct contribution to make at this stage of human society." '

Mrs Robert E. Speer of the United States called attention to a remark of Professor Einstein to the effect that old evils last on because we have not

discovered how to shatter the hold of evil traditions. She said

that one of the new facts in the world was the changed status of women, and women could break the evil tradition. If there was one thing to which the Church was summoned it was to face the implications of our Lord's teaching about women. Women had a silent and invisible power, and the Church needed to be summoned to study Christ's teaching on this subject. A whole new set of standards had come into the life of womanhood.

The war had accelerated the urgency of the problem. In many ways women were attaining to freedom that was dangerous to human society. They must think through the place of women in the Christian society.

The best way to study this question was from the point of view of the Gospels, getting into the mind of Christ. She would suggest that there was need for a fresh study of the Mother of our Lord without involving us in the perils of Mariolatry. She would reverently suggest that there was need for a new study of the significance of the Virgin Birth.

VII. SECULARISM AND CHRISTIANITY

There had been, in the discussion, slighter attention to secularism as one of the great systems confronting Christianity to-day than to the non-Christian religions, but at the beginning of the debate Bishop McConnell had it in mind when he said

that the message of Christ was misunderstood in the world to-day because of lack of conformity between the message proclaimed and the people who proclaimed it. There was very little to be complacent about in looking over the world to-day. The United States of America was too largely pagan. They were following the strange gods of nationalism to-day. They were easily moved by a militaristic ideal which was the same as practical atheism. They wanted to feel the challenge of all this. There was a great danger in complacency. There

was the complacency even of missionaries in too closely adapting themselves to pagan social points of view.

The complacency of pessimism was as bad as the complacency of optimism. The delegates to the conference came anxious to be taught. The missionary world, both in the persons of the missionaries and in the nationals of the lands in which missionary activity was carried on, had not made a large enough contribution to the teaching of the Gospel to those of the sending countries. It was not to the credit of the younger churches that they had not yet produced a single heresy. Truth was alive ; it was like seed, and you did not preserve seed by standing guard over it, but by scattering it abroad over the land with a complete willingness to take risks.

And at the close of the discussion Mr H. A. Grimshaw of Geneva dealt with it in certain respects. He said

that the secular civilization under discussion was his civilization, which had been left to pursue its secular way influenced less and less by organized Christianity. The gap between them had widened, and was still widening, and the reason for the extension of the breach lay in the fact that organized Christianity had condoned the evils of that civilization—in particular, war and social injustice.

His own special work was at the International Labour Office, Geneva, where they were concerned with those parts of the world to which secular civilization was now being exported, and he had come to see that what they exported in the most efficient, persistent and enthusiastic way were precisely these elements of their secular civilization which in the past had produced social injustice and the most widespread suffering. These evils were being introduced where there existed no limits or check to them, either in the form of public opinion or in that of possible successful resistance.

In the great task of remedying social injustice, the International Labour Office could do the preparatory and technical work ; it could study and analyse and prepare reports. But its work would remain ineffective without the support of public opinion. He must turn to them, to the workers in the mission field who felt as keenly and bitterly as he felt.

They must speak, they must create that public opinion which alone made progressive action possible. 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?'

This account has covered all the speakers and their contributions in the general debate, with the exception of two, each of whom made an interesting and distinctive contribution.

VIII. STUDENTS AND CHRISTIANITY

Miss M. Crutchfield of the United States spoke for the students and the younger generation. She said:

'There is need for a new emphasis in the Christian message as it is presented to students. For them, religion must meet their quest for God and for abundant life on earth. When God is presented to them as Father and the source of life on earth as seen in Jesus, it satisfies their minds and brings a great influx of life. This holds till they begin to observe that many of our present ways of living do not accord with such a belief, and that they face the 'losing of an eye' or hand, 'hating' their family, perhaps losing their life, if in their situation they live according to it. They are in a dilemma. If they are honest they must modify their idea of God or live up to it. They lose the zest of life if they modify it. They lose their life if they live up to it.

'Yet they see that Jesus based His life on this belief and died to keep it in the world, for us who do not live up to it and who maintain conditions that would make Him die again if He were here.

'If at this point they grasp the belief of some of Christ's followers that He died but lives again, it leaves them almost breathless with a new idea about God and the nature of life. Might it be that by such dying one finds life? Once that idea gets hold of them it forces them to try it and they find that it means life eternal.

'In the presentation of the Christian message they need this new emphasis: that it is life to join with God in redeeming the world. Not that they redeem it, or that the

idea originates with them. It is God's gift. But it is also a part of His gift that men may share in this a little with Him. And such sharing is abundant life, is salvation.

'This is not strongly enough emphasized in the Christian message. It is too often presented as something that God has done, something that Christ has done for us. Students need also the thought of sharing it with God.

'Not only students, many Christians need this emphasis. It is the Church's lack of this belief and of the 'dangerous' living it would lead to that makes thinking students believe it has no message for them or the world.

'This conception of God is very demanding and few Christians live up to it. I want a statement which will help those who hesitate to join in redeeming any part of the world where they may live.'

IX. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE

The other special note was the word of Professor Erasmo Braga of Brazil, who said

that Latin America was deeply concerned about the message of Christianity to the people of the Orient. The people of Latin America had become tired of the religion which they had been taught for four centuries. One of their leaders in reform had said, 'They are groping in darkness, and will not lay hold on superstition thrown to them.' Some of the intellectuals were looking at new cults, even doctrines derived from Buddhism and Hinduism, to find a substitute for the old-time religion which they had tried and found wanting.

Some of their intellectuals were actually saying that religion was immoral. They said so because they had found the religion with which they had been acquainted to be out-worn, and to have oppressed them.

Latin America was fast becoming the great storm centre of the world. Even the so-called Christian nations might cause Latin America to become overwhelmed by secularism. There were great treasures there to be exploited and they should not become weapons to win a victory for secularism.

X. SUMMARY

The general discussions were closed at the end of Friday morning by the Bishop of Manchester, and the Council divided into sections to discuss in greater detail the subject of the Christian Message in relation to (1) Confucianism, (2) Buddhism, (3) Hinduism, (4) Islam, (5) Secularism. Some of these sectional meetings embodied their conclusions in definite findings not submitted to the Council or adopted by it, but placed in the hands of the committee which prepared the statement adopted by the Council regarding the Christian Message. This Message [1] and the sectional findings,[2] so far as any were formulated, will be found in other sections of this volume.

The Bishop of Manchester in summarizing said that unless they had been following the discussion with the deliberate object of finding some unity in it, it would appear to have been passing to and fro between opposite points of view, but in reality there had been one central idea which had come more and more to the front in the course of discussion, one idea with different kinds of applications.

There were certain things said that had not been challenged. There had been Dr Kraemer's plea for a really Christian world view, a Christian *Weltanschauung*. Those of them whose vocation was on the academic side had a very big task on hand. Theology had been worked out in detail, piecemeal, but not as a whole. Then, there was the unanimous testimony as to what the Gospel has meant for the women of the world. No word of qualification had been spoken. Increasingly the influence of women had been growing in the world, and they must realize what their testimony was going to signify for the Christianity of the future.

There was a saying of Father Kelly's to the effect that there used to be a thing called 'theology' which was Greek, meaning 'thinking about God,' which had become very unpopular, and there was a thing called the 'philosophy of

[1] See pp. 479–95. [2] See pp. 381–414.

religion ' which meant thinking about our own nice feelings and it had become very popular. The word ' value ' was inevitably vague in its meaning because it had generally a subjective reference. They could only be clear if they thought about objective values. To talk about values might set people asking, ' Does Christianity suit the Hindu ? ' Whereas the real question should be, ' Does the Hindu, or the Chinese, or the Arab suit Christianity ? ' Dr Jowett, the Master of Balliol, was asked by a young lady what he thought about God. Jowett replied, ' That is a very unimportant question ; all that signifies is what God thinks about me.'

If the Gospel was true, it was true everywhere. Business men never believed that the subtlety of the Oriental mind was such as to make two and two equal something other than four ; and two and two make four everywhere. Jesus claimed that all authority was given unto Him in heaven and on earth, and that was either true or not.

They were able to welcome Canon Gould's insistence that the younger churches were the children of the older churches and of the older teaching. They had every reason to be grateful for this. The great missionary enterprise had its origin when Christianity was much less complex than it was to-day. They did not have so full an interpretation based on a world experience as it is possible for us to have now. And it was certainly right for the central message to be delivered in its simplicity at first. But when Canon Gould went on to ask if the situation had so changed that the method must be altered, they must say, ' Yes ' ; the indigenous churches had developed. They had not given us a new Christ, but the same Christ seen from a new point of view. They had not given us a supplement to the Gospel, but something that was supplementary to our conception of the Gospel.

It was the glory of Christianity that it was the most materialistic of religions, while not being less spiritual than others. It was so spiritual that it could face and claim to control the material world. Its basic affirmation was that the Word was made flesh. The whole of Christianity was sacramental. It maintained that the processes of time could be made to express the truth of the eternal. It was there that they could have the unification of the two sides that had been presented with so much force. It was quite true that they needed a fulcrum outside the world on which to rest the lever with

which to move the world. If they lost the fact that the Gospel was the gift of God, they lost something that was utterly vital. It was also true that the roots must be planted firmly before they could expect the fruits, but must they not look for the fruits ?

Christianity was truth. It was a revelation of God. It disclosed Him supremely as Righteous Will. There was one great broad division between the religion of the Bible as compared with all other religions, and it consisted in the emphasis which it placed upon Righteous Will. It was Righteous Will set over against static being. And their task was to bring their own active wills into conformity with that Righteous Will. But they were always trying to turn it the other way round.

' God is love,' and they tried to make the great truth comfortable for themselves. If they really believed it, it would frighten them out of their wits. All that was opposed to love was doomed to destruction. ' Perfect love casteth out fear.' But the imperfection of their love gave them every reason to regard this truth as very terrifying. They would not be syncretistic like the boys with the compound insect, but it was a very different thing to say that what they found of good in these other religions was to be found in Christ. By studying all that was good in other religions they might find out something more about Christ Himself. He would then be revealed as the desire of all nations.

With regard to secular civilization they must recognize its strength. It was a great ethical force. Manchester business men were very proud of the fact that daily bargains affecting large sums were made on the Stock Exchange simply by word of mouth or on scraps of paper. They could trust one another and that was good as far as it went. But when some business was prospering and the value of shares went up, there were sometimes people who knew when the shares were just going to drop again and decided to sell out at a high figure ; if it was really too high they said that that was the concern of the purchaser of the shares. But the purchaser of the shares was not the only person concerned. Mills might be closed, thousands of workpeople might be thrown out of work, simply because some people sold shares for more than they were really worth. They must say as part of their Christian message to the commercial world that the area

of recognized responsibility ought to be extended. It was thus that all moral progress had been made. They must insist that the universality of the claims of Christ applies to all these regions of life. It was not a substitute for personal conversion. It was to be an incentive to it. There was a real risk of secularizing their religion by bringing all these things into it. It was dangerous and the risk was there. They were grateful to those who warned them. But instead of secularizing their religion they should be able to spiritualize it in a way that was both deeper and wider. Horrible things did not occur because some few people were grossly wicked, but simply because there were so many people who were just as good as others, and no better. So concern for these apparently secular concerns became an incentive to a yet deeper personal consecration because the area to be won for Christ was greater.

The message was still the same old message, ' Jesus only,' but Jesus as Saviour of the whole world, Jesus as the King of all life in every conceivable activity.

There the discussion ended and the ultimate thought of the Council later appeared in the Message, which with unity of mind and gratitude of heart it adopted and sent forth.

REPORTS OF SECTIONAL MEETINGS

CHRISTIANITY AND HINDUISM

Findings

THE group spent the greater part of the time allotted to it in general discussion of the relations of Christianity and Hinduism and of the problems contained in the presentation of the Christian faith to Hindus, the record of its discussion being made available for the other group to which the Council remitted the consideration of the Christian Message to the world. It did, however, record its opinion of the preliminary paper submitted by Dr Macnicol as follows :

' This group considers that Dr Macnicol's paper, considering its necessary brevity, presents on the whole an admirable comparison of the outstanding spiritual values of Hinduism, and those Christian ideas which correspond to them.

' Some are of opinion that it would have been well if there had been another paper dealing with those aspects of Hinduism referred to by Dr Macnicol in the opening paragraph of the section " The Hindu Situation," and that separate treatment should have been given to the place of Hinduism of the home, with the religious duties which centre in it, together with the contribution which woman, by her loyalty to these and by her patient service and sacrifice, makes towards the spiritual life of the community.[1]

[1] See Dr Macnicol's comment, p. 3.

Account of Discussion

The points brought out in the discussions of the group may conveniently be summarized under three heads :

(*a*) The spiritual values of Hinduism.
(*b*) Obstacles in the way of the Gospel.
(*c*) The Christian life and message.

(*a*) *Spiritual values of Hinduism.* The group felt itself incompetent to offer, in the short time available for its discussion, developed views on the spiritual values of Hinduism, and considered the matter definitely in relation to the presentation of the Christian Message to Hindus, and the points of contact which could be used in this connexion.

Objection was raised to the statement that Hinduism is morally impotent ; gentleness, patience, ability to suffer were mentioned as indications of spiritual power not uncommon among Hindus. Mr Paul urged the importance of the way in which *karma* and *dharma* (i.e. the moral law of cause and effect, and the moral law of obligation to do one's duty) covered each other all over India. There was in his view a recognition of Christ on the part of large numbers of Hindus.

Mr Chenchiah emphasized the point that many Hindus feel that they have in their own systems of thought all that they can find in Christianity, and the fact that many, while accepting Christ's teaching, find difficulty in regarding Him as an incarnation of God in a unique sense.

Dr Rudolf Otto (a visitor to the group at one meeting) discussed the question as to whether Christ should be considered the prolongation of a line begun in Hinduism. He quoted the remark of

Schleiermacher that coming to Christ is never a prolongation but always a break. The gulf between the two systems probably was found in the idea of the 'holy.' Admittedly there were similarities between the Hindu *bhakti* and the Christian faith, and something in the *Bhagavad-gita* which resembles justification by faith, but he held that there was a gulf between the two. The Hindu religion lacked the Christian idea that men are apart from God in an ethical sense. He instanced Pandita Ramabai as showing that when Christ finds a Hindu it means a complete break in his religious experience.

Miss Tilak in relation to this gave two outstanding examples of men who had been led to Christ along the way of *bhakti*, and saw in that idea something very like the Christian idea of devotion and self-surrender to a personal God. Others felt that Christ to some comes as a fulfilment, to others He means a break with the past.

(*b*) *Obstacles in the way of the Gospel.* Canon Garfield Williams felt two main obstacles in the way of the presentation of the Gospel to Hindus to be the Hindu desire for an esoteric faith and the necessarily institutional character of the Christian Church. Mr S. K. Chatterji agreed with the second point particularly and urged the necessity for India to express Christ in Indian ways.

Miss Tilak emphasized the difficulties found in relation to cultural development. Some Christians feel more at home among Hindus than in the Christian Church. Indian Christians do not sufficiently cherish their Indian heritage and sometimes are not genuinely Christian enough, having failed fully to assimilate the Message which had come to them in forms of western thought. She insisted that Indians must accept

Christ as a personal Saviour, otherwise Indian Christians cannot pass Him on. She drew attention to the special opportunity of Indian Christian women with the Hindu woman whose heart was still untainted by the growing secularism.

A Chinese woman member of the group mentioned that it is possible by openly despising idol worshippers to prejudice the hearer against the Gospel, and gave a warning against being too proud in the presentation of the Gospel.

Principal McKenzie urged the condition of the Christian society as the most serious difficulty in the way of winning the Hindu, especially the educated classes. He referred to the well-known fact that large numbers of the members of the Church had been recruited from the untouchables, and that it must take a long time before such a Church can manifest the knowledge and power which would appeal to higher castes of Hindus. He suggested the *ashram* as one method of dealing with this problem and compared its possible functions with those of the monasteries of the Middle Ages. The other side of this picture was presented by Dr Frimodt-Möller, who showed how in some parts of South India caste Hindus were being drawn to Christ because of the change He had made in their outcaste neighbours; while Dr Stanley Jones said that the Church among the outcastes should be compared with the background from which the outcastes had come.

Reference was made to the political difficulty and the unwillingness of Hindus to come into the Christian church while India was not on an equality with the other nations of the world, lest it weaken their case for *swaraj*. Reference was also made to the widespread attraction of Hindu educated people,

both men and women, to Christ, combined with the inability of many of these people to contemplate a change in religion any more than a change of nationality or sex.

(*c*) *The Christian life and message.* Dr Stanley Jones urged that the idea of the Kingdom of God, the meaning of love as understood in Christ, the peace that is enjoyed in Christ, and the Cross are all unique in religion; that in a new birth there is a breaking of chains and an ushering in of a new life and that Christ is not only unique but also universal. Dr Jones thought that Christ is more than the crown of Hinduism in that He fulfils the religious desire implicit in Hinduism rather than the religious expression stated in Hinduism. The realization of God and the freedom so obtained is more than is meant by *moksha* (release). In his view the best approach to Hinduism is through Christian experience, relating itself to the desire of the Hindu for freedom from the world. He thought the emphasis should be placed on the certainty of God which came out of Pentecost.

Mr Narasimhan said that he approached Hindus as men, with the Gospel 'the Son of Man is come to seek and save that which is lost.' It was necessary, in his view, to emphasize the reality of sin and to create the sense of need for a Saviour. Mr Paul urged that India should be left to interpret Christ in her own way, and Mr Chenchiah urged that nothing is axiomatic in regard to Christianity as betweeen the East and the West except Christ. He described the work of a small group of Indian Christians who were claiming freedom to interpret Him for themselves, untrammelled by any considerations whatever.

Mr Kuruvilla referred to the indefiniteness found in Hinduism as to the ultimate reality, the nature of

God and the fact of sin. It was necessary to convince the Hindu that Christians have the truth regarding these matters by showing the fruits expected in those who claim definite knowledge and by being prepared to suffer with those who are suffering, and to sacrifice all for the moral certainty that is claimed.

Dr Richter pointed out the different presentations of Christ in different parts of the New Testament whereby He is related to those for whom these different passages were first written, and argued from this that, grateful for the fact that the teaching of Jesus is attracting India, we should try to relate Him to the longing of the Hindu heart.

Mr Chenchiah and Mr Kuruvilla further dwelt on the need for showing that in contact with Christ there is a power which no other can give, and on the need for Christian spiritual experience such that the fulness of the Spirit may be imparted to others.

CONFUCIANISM

Account of Discussion

Introduction

AFTER Confucianism had come in for its proportionate share of consideration on the floor of the Council a group of twenty-five men and women met on two afternoons for further study and deliberation, under the chairmanship of Dr T. C. Chao.

The group as such set out to make no formal pronouncement, but rather to try to share with one another the knowledge which each had of Confucianism, growing out of his or her own study and

experience, and to record observations of how Confucianism affects the life and thought of the people of China, Korea and Japan. There was also in the hearts and minds of all an earnest desire to discover the points wherein, and the methods by which, Christianity can make a contribution in terms of ideas, ideals and life itself not to Confucianism as a system but to men and women and little children living under the influence of Confucianism and in some points of life and experience greatly benefited by it.

The group had before it the preliminary papers by Dr Stuart and Dr Lyon.[1] What is reported here is made up of notes taken in the meetings, except that in some instances the extemporaneous statements of certain speakers are supplemented by quotations from their writings dealing with the same ideas as given in supplementary material available at Jerusalem.

Is Confucianism a Religion?

In response to the question, 'Is Confucianism a religion?' Francis C. M. Wei said:

'Confucianism is a term put over on the Chinese by the Westerner. It is not found even in the writings of the scholars of the early part of the Manchu dynasty, less than three hundred years ago, although the Jesuits began using it about that time. *Ju Chiao*, or The Religion of the Scholar, is the term which is commonly used among the Chinese. . . . There are religious values in *Ju Chiao*, but they were not contributed originally by Confucius.'

The judgment of the chairman, Dr T. C. Chao, is very similar. He says that

Confucianism, while comprehending the civilization of pre-Confucian times, may be called a semi-religious system. The

[1] See pp. 53, 83.

Ancient Sage himself was by no means a founder of any religion, nor was he in any way a religious teacher. He did not even create an original ethic, although we often hear people use the term 'Confucian ethics.' Both the ethical ideals based upon the family system of social organization, and the metaphysic that served as the foundation or cosmic basis of this ethic, existed before Confucius, who simply systematized them, and made them prominent and more or less coherent for the ancient people.

Dr Hocking of Harvard spoke of religion as being latent in Confucianism. By way of example he called attention to Confucius' statement that his enemies could not harm him until he had done his work and to a further remark, viz. 'He who offends the gods has no one to whom he can pray.'

Dr Endicott of Canada, for a number of years a close student of Confucianism in China, said that

there was in Confucius a strong reaction towards superstition; this was a point of strength, but on the other hand there was no strong indication of belief in a personal God. Confucius was evidently a religious man without being a religious teacher. If his people had not believed so much, he might have believed more. We must remember that the cult of Confucius began centuries after Confucius himself lived.

Dr D. Willard Lyon gave two statements which adequately summarized this discussion as follows:

The Confucianism of to-day is the resultant of all the cultural influences which have been at work throughout the ages. It is the experience of a race that has lived long. Like a great river it has continued its fructifying flow through every age and every phase of Chinese life. It has gathered soil from hillsides widely separated in time and space and has left its rich deposits in unexpected places throughout the years. It has been, and in great measure still is, China's way of life.

Confucianism has always fostered the fear of heaven and

the worship of departed spirits. In spite of the fact that Confucius was quite reticent in expressing himself regarding the spirit world, the future life and God, his followers throughout the centuries have continued to act as if they believed in a Supreme Being and the reality of the Unseen. Their belief in predestination has been so universal and dominating that it has amounted to fatalism. . . . Whatever name may be given to the Supreme Force, there is a basic assumption that the will of this Force cannot be circumvented. Furthermore, the worship of the spirits of the dead, which has not been wholly destroyed by the encroachments of modern science, is another element in Confucian practice which is clearly religious.

Are Confucianism and Christianity to be considered as Opposing Forces?

Both Mr Wei and Miss Tseng insisted that there is no essential conflict between them. The thought here would seem to be that while Confucianism may fail to teach some things which find a large place in Christian ethics, no positive teaching of Confucius runs counter to Christian principles dealing with the same subject. In the realm of ethics at least a Confucianist in becoming a Christian would not find it necessary to abrogate the noble teachings he had learned from Confucius, but would find in Christianity many things which would either complement or supplement these standards of right conduct.

Mr Wei pointed out that the theme of Mencius, the great disciple and interpreter of Confucius, is the 'Harmony of Nature.'

To become in harmony with the universe is the way of man. Harmonious development of men in society and with nature is a point of insistence in Confucianism which has permanent value.

Dr T. C. Chao expresses the same idea by way of interpretation of this ethical basis of Confucianism.

> Heaven and earth have manifested a moral constancy in their uniform ways. The universe is a system and not a chaos. In all the work of nature is found an exhibition of sincerity which in turn ought to be the starting-point of a moral life.

Ancestor Worship

If the ethic of Confucianism forms no barrier but contrariwise, perhaps even a help to Confucianists in becoming Christians, can we say the same for ancestor worship? Dr C. Y. Cheng, a member of the Council, though not of this special Commission on Confucianism, as quoted in Dr Lyon's preliminary pamphlet, gives his answer as follows:

> From time immemorial the Chinese race has cherished and observed the remembrances of their departed parents. Ancestor commemoration has always held a strong place in the family life of the people and continues to do so even up to the present day. Chinese life is built upon the unity of the family, and filial piety has been the backbone of the Chinese ethical code. But, alas, this simple and perfectly commendable tradition was in time corrupted by the introduction of a good deal of superstition and idol worship. People departed from the original custom and added to it much that is not desirable and helpful. It became a mixture both of ethical reverence for one's ancestors and of superstitious practices. When the Christian religion made its entrance to China, this custom of the commemoration of ancestors had drifted far away from its original and pure form, and had in it much that could not be reconciled with the teaching of Christ, who enjoined the worship of the one and only God our Father. . . . For years this was the greatest obstacle in hindering men and women from becoming followers of the way of our Lord.

However, Mr Wei, looking at the matter from a slightly different point of view, said :

'Ancestor worship represents the beautiful sentiment of a community of the quick and the dead. It is the duty of the living to keep the family forever going on. The classic of *Filial Piety*, a book which comes late in Confucianist literature, teaches that an individual lives not for himself but for his family. Even to-day people say, " Glorify your ancestors and reflect honour on your clan."

'There is something in this which we ought not to let go. It does divide but it also binds, for it teaches that we should glorify the clan, and this helps society as a whole. The family system may go and with it ancestor worship, but a substitute such as patriotism must be found. However, national patriotism is not broad enough. Herein is an opportunity of the Christian Church to preach the doctrine of the community of saints, world-wide in scope, but we cannot present this with a divided Church.'

Mr Wei thinks the trend of the thinking of Chinese Christians is toward the preservation of this ancient custom even within the Church, distinguishing as many people, both Christian and non-Christian alike, already do between reverence or respect and worship.

Weaknesses of Confucianism

However, in the midst of words of high praise for Confucianism and the glad recognition of its various elements of value which should be preserved, points of weakness were frequently brought forward. One of these is the fact that, at best, the position accorded by Confucianism to women is one of deadly dulness even if not of degradation. Miss Tseng quoted Confucius as having said that it is very difficult to keep company with women or small-minded men. And, again, when some one told Confucius that there were ten people to help in ruling the country, he said :

'There are only nine because one is a woman.' Miss Tseng argued that the women of China must have that message of Him who, born of a woman, revealed some of His deepest messages to women and gave them their rightful place as members of society and citizens of the Kingdom.

Another weakness often referred to is that Confucianism is largely for scholars and does not make any significant contribution to the common people. This point was made vivid for some by the answer Mr Wei gave to the question as to why so many Confucian temples are now unused and are in a state of decay. Mr Wei replied, 'The places of worship were for the scholars and the breakdown of the classical education necessarily affected the temple worship.' He added that not more than 15 per cent of the people of China knew anything at all about the Temple of Heaven.

Dr Chao said that Confucius taught, 'The way to make a man good is to educate him.' But those who know, that is, the scholars, have seemed content to let the great masses of people go untaught and uncared for. No satisfactory answer was given by any as to what Confucianism had to say by way of comfort and help to the poor and the despairing, to men and women conscious of failure, of sin and of dishonour. It was admitted that perhaps there is a poor kind of joy for the ordinary human being in that sense of his own insignificance which is inculcated by Confucianism.

There seems to be nothing in Confucianism corresponding to that which made the common people hear Jesus gladly. Dr Endicott said that

> in all his years of contact with the Chinese people he had never seen one man who confessed to having found joy in his

religion. Surely that religion which was proclaimed as tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people ought to be made available for the Chinese and others who, even though they have profited much by Confucianism, have in their hearts and minds great realms of needs still unmet.

Perhaps the basic weakness in Confucianism as a religious system, or as something able to redeem and sustain, fortify and enhearten man, is the lack of a satisfying conception of God. Dr Lyon quoted one Chinese scholar on this point: 'The greatest shortcoming of Confucius, and perhaps he knew it himself,' is that, 'Confucius did not know what kind of a God he believed in. He stopped when he reached the highest good. He educated his students to the highest pitch and held them up there, without attaching them to the highest person or God.'

Contribution of Christianity to Confucianists

It is at this point, as all agreed and many expressed in different ways, that Christianity can and must make its great contribution to Confucianists. And, as is always the case, along with this idea of God as revealed in and through Jesus Christ, will go many things corollary to it.

This fact, the following statement by Dr Chao, given now as a fitting summary to all the discussions, clearly reveals:

We do not need a new Christian message, but the old one must be seen in a new light and with more comprehensive understanding:

(*a*) We must present the Christian message in language which the Chinese can understand.

(*b*) We must present it not alone with words, but also with our lives.

(*c*) The emphasis to-day should be individual rather than social; this does not mean that we should neglect the social

elements in Christianity or the social implications of the teaching of Jesus. It does mean, however, that Chinese people need a deepened loneliness with God.

The Chinese to-day are being swept along in a mass movement in which individual people are lost in the group. It is necessary for them all to realize themselves anew, as persons in the presence of God. They also need a deepened sense of sin together with a sense of their own impotency as over against the sustaining power of Jesus Christ.

In Christ we find at least a practical solution of the problem of conflict and of the more individual and personal problem of sin. Harmony must come through a consciousness on the one hand of separation from God, and on the other of a possibility of union with God.

(*d*) We need a world philosophy—cogent thinking about life as a whole. Great emphasis must be placed on this point through American and English missionaries. We have become too utilitarian ; we need the element of utilitarianism, but we need much more a sense of both the immanent and the transcendant ; we need a world view which comprehends and seeks to blend both of these things. Only in this will we find a real anchorage for life. This does not exclude our need for philosophy, science, art, economics and so forth.

The younger generation in China is pushing its life out to include all these things, but they need a new interpretation of life as a whole.

CHRISTIANITY AND BUDDHISM

Findings

I. Attitude

THE Christian attitude towards Buddhism and Buddhists should rest upon a sympathetic and discriminating insight into what are the essentials of the Christian life and message on the one hand, and what, on the other hand, are the actual facts about

Buddhism and the lives of those who regard themselves as adherents of this way of life.

1. Such an insight will find in original Buddhism certain great values, chief of which are the Buddha's emphasis on the reality of the moral law in human life, his sympathy for the woes of the world, and the spirit of self-sacrifice that led him to seek for his fellow-men a way of escape from life's sufferings and sorrows. It will, however, find serious divergence from the essentials of religion as revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ. It will above all else see that where the Buddha had little or nothing to say about God, Jesus Christ makes absolutely central the Personal Moral Lawgiver, the Heavenly Father, whose will it is that all men shall be holy as He is holy, and who through His forgiving love has provided the way for all those who receive Christ Jesus to become His true children.

2. This insight will find in the subsequent evolution of Buddhism certain developments which in a measure make good some of the serious deficiencies in the religion of the founder. These developments include a dim recognition of the reality of the Eternal God, a truer appreciation of the significance of human personality and a recognition of the possibility of making this a better world. Yet these developments have nothing to compare with the basis in actual history which we have in the Person of Jesus Christ. Moreover, a spirit of indiscriminating tolerance has admitted many unworthy accretions which have obscured for the millions of adherents such elements of good as Buddhism may have possessed.

3. In modern Buddhism a sympathetic insight will discover, along with a most perplexing mixture of values inherited from the past, a reaching out for

the new values inherent in our common world-culture, which to-day is permeating all Buddhist lands, an attempt on the part of educated leaders to reform and vitalize their religion and a desire on the part of individuals for an enrichment of their lives along the lines made possible by modern science. But it will also be found that even in the minds of many leaders, spiritual values are exceedingly hazy, and that while there is a readiness more and more to accept the great certainties centring round Personality for which Christianity stands, there is no clearness of conviction about these certainties, and no determination to reject those elements in present-day Buddhism which hinder the working out of truth in the lives of men.

II. The Message

The Christian message is not to be regarded as merely supplementary to what Buddhists already teach. The Christian receives his message from God in Christ Jesus, and he must be unequivocally clear and positive in the utterance of this message, both in word and in life. The very fact that Buddhism is, as a rule, so ready to compromise with everything that it meets, makes it all the more necessary for the Christian to state clearly the great essentials of his own faith. However tactful the Christian should be in presenting his message, there can be no tampering with the essentials of that message, nor can there be any ' patchwork religion.'

The message to Buddhists must, therefore, be essentially the same as the message to all men. Nevertheless, in giving this message, there are some things that should be particularly emphasized.

1. God the Father, God as personal, though

infinitely transcending what we have in ourselves experienced as personal beings.

2. God as Ethical Will, and our moral intuitions, guided by the Spirit of Christ, as giving our deepest insight into His Being. Buddhist scholars to-day have a great appreciation of the Kantian philosophy, which renders this approach peculiarly appropriate.

3. The Supreme Personality of the historic Jesus Christ as the expression of God's forgiving love, and as the dynamic for man's attainment of a truly ethical personality. Many modern Buddhists claim that the achievement of ethical personality is their highest goal. Hence to this longing Jesus Christ can be effectively presented as the power through whom such a goal can be really attained.

4. The forgiveness of sins, not by means of ritual exercises, but through the free grace of God in the sacrifice of the Cross.

5. The permanent meaning and value of the human personality, recreated in the likeness of Jesus Christ. Millions of Buddhists long for immortality and vaguely believe this to be possible, but the agonizing doubts arising from the insecure foundations of the past, and from the materialism of the present day, undermine this supreme hope of mankind. Only in the presence of Christ Jesus is there real assurance.

6. The Kingdom of God on earth ruled by our loving Father. This involves respect for human personality, love for men and a determined opposition to all forces that hinder their full salvation. Hence the demand for clean living in all human relationships, and chiefly in the primary relationship represented in the Christian home. At no point is the beauty of the Christian life more clearly revealed to the Buddhist than in a real Christian home ; here,

above all other places, the Christian's message and the Christian's life are one.

CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

Findings

I. Our Approach

THE study of the Christian life and message in relation to Islam can be rightly approached only in a spirit of penitence, humility and understanding love.

In a spirit of penitence, as we remember the mistakes of the Christian Church in the past, its lack of love for Moslems and its unbelief in the power of Christ to draw Moslems unto Himself.

In a spirit of humility because of failure in our own day adequately to present Christ to the world of Islam ; because of our share in racial and national antipathies ; and also because God has overruled even our mistakes, and where we have failed in our witness has, in divers manners throughout the ages, revealed Himself by His Spirit in the hearts of many who own allegiance to Islam.

In a spirit of understanding love, for they are our very brothers and sisters. God is their Father, even if they know it not. If we claim that the Spirit of Jesus dwells in us, we are thereby under obligation to follow His example in giving ourselves for them in sacrificing love.

II. Spiritual Values in Islam

Our loyalty to Christ, who is Incarnate Truth and Love, leads us to recognize certain spiritual values in

the Moslem's faith. It is of supreme importance for us, each in his own area, to recognize and to understand these spiritual values ; to distinguish sharply between those of historic Islamic origin and those of late or recent acceptance ; to respect them honestly and to present Christ as the Living Lord of all, in whom alone these spiritual values are fully realized, and through whose Spirit they can become fully effective in human life and relationships in the world to-day and in the life to come.

III. The Issue between Islam and Christianity

In contrast with these spiritual values in Islam there stand out deep and vital issues between Islam and Christianity. These issues are the justification of missions to Moslems. The profoundest issue is the fact that Islam from the beginning of its history denies the unique and exclusive claim of Christ. The very character of the Christian message, therefore, involving the love of God through His Incarnate Word, the death of Christ on the Cross, His atonement for sin and His resurrection, is in sharp contrast to the teaching of Islam.

IV. Presentation of the Christian Message

The Christian message can most effectively be presented to Moslems not only by the spoken and printed word, but also through the sacrificial lives of Christians expressing the truth and power of the Holy Spirit in their personal and corporate life. One of the greatest problems in missionary work among Moslems is the missionary himself. What really matters is such a life of love, humility and faith toward God and toward each other as will prove

an irresistible testimony for Christ our Lord. The deepest need in many Moslem lands is that the Christian churches, both old and new, should be set aglow by the Spirit of God with a real, self-sacrificing love for their Moslem neighbours.

V. The Implications and Application of the Christian Message

In teaching and preaching a real and sympathetic knowledge of Islam, both historical and such as is found to-day in any particular country, is indispensable. Otherwise the message cannot be given in terms of thought and expression adapted to the hearers.

Special emphasis should be laid on those aspects of truth which Islam in some degree possesses, namely, the unity, majesty and sovereignty of God, reverence to God in worship, His revelation to man ; and even more on those aspects of truth in which Islam is deficient, namely, God's love and holiness, the nature of sin, Christ's suffering in redemption and His resurrection from the dead and the indwelling Spirit of God.

A true and complete application of Christianity must aim at showing that the Lord Jesus Christ not only fully meets the deep aspirations of the soul of man, but also is all-sufficient for the needs of the individual in every human relationship, and of society in all its aspects—industrial, economic and social. Therefore the Christian message must find expression in all forms of Christian social service. It must stress the sacredness of personality, elevate the position of woman, emphasize the sanctity of marriage and be dynamic for the uplift of family life.

VI. Special Difficulties

Among the special difficulties in presenting the Christian message to Moslems we emphasize the lack of faith and love in the Christian Church; the insufficient number of adequately trained Christian missionaries; the absence in the indigenous churches of a spirit which at any cost is willing, ready and able to provide a satisfying spiritual home for Moslem converts; the deeply rooted self-satisfaction of the Moslem, the close-knit social and economic as well as the religious ties of the Islamic system; the lack of religious liberty in certain Moslem countries; the dread law of apostasy and the identification of Christianity in the mind of the Moslem with racial antipathies and with the political policies and practices of western governments.

Over against these difficulties in the presentation of the Christian message must be set the increasing number of avowed and secret believers, the building up of a church from Moslems in certain areas, and the striking changes in attitude which have taken place in many Moslem countries with regard to the Christian life and message.

VII. The Urgency of the Hour and the Call to Action

The time has come for the whole Christian Church to face its task in the world of Islam with a more resolute faith, a more understanding love and a definite programme of immediate advance. To kindle a new missionary passion in the oriental churches, united, prevailing prayer and sacrificial life in the churches of the West are the most cogent necessity. The western churches must provide an

increasing number of men and women whose hearts are aflame with love for these millions and who by special training hold the key to the Moslem mind and heart.

We must relate the Christian life and message to Islam not merely by words but by action until all social bondage is broken, all moral darkness dispelled and the Moslem world is brought to see the 'light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.'

SECULAR CIVILIZATION

Account of Discussion

So great was the interest in the subject of the Christian Life and Message in Relation to Modern Secularism that it was necessary to hold two meetings, and these were attended by nearly half the members of the Council. In the following report of the discussion the two meetings have been combined and Canon Raven's summarizing statement, which was made at the end of the first meeting, has been placed at the close of the discussion.

Dr C. R. Watson of Cairo said :

'The Moslem world has been greatly affected by secularism. It has taken two main forms : first, the increase of wealth ; second, the cultural influence of Europe. The atheism of Christian lands has affected the Moslem world.

'We find in Moslem towns the cotton mill and the mosque. The influence of the former now predominates. The motto of the modern Moslem is "There is no God but cotton, and the pound sterling is the apostle of cotton."

'We must deplore the spiritual effects of this new situation. It has produced indifference to worship ; the number of

prayers has been reduced from five to one in many cases. Moreover, the old morality of Islam has declined under western influences.'

Mr Donald Fay of China said :

'The visitor to China receives the impression that every Chinese is religious, being a Confucian, Taoist or Buddhist. Western civilization, however, has greatly shaken the old order. Three periods in the development of this influence may be noted : (1) the disintegration of moral standards ; (2) the intellectual period. Many intellectuals believe that religion is utterly useless. An anti-Christian movement has appeared as a result, especially among students. (3) We are now in a spiritual or metaphysical period. There has manifested itself a new religious hunger. A great opportunity presents itself for Christian education, for teachers who will change the mind of the intellectual class, for men who will make the Chinese realize that Christ is the only Saviour, and God the only Father—in a word, that God alone can satisfy.'

Dr Henri Anet of Belgium said that

as a Doctor of Science, he deplored the fact that in recent years Europe has been shipping its worst and its most out-of-date books to foreign countries. He found in Egypt books in French and German which had been good sellers twenty years ago, but were now out of date. Workers in the Orient should not fear the crisis ; their countries are but passing through the positivistic period that Europe passed through years ago. Soon Europe's best ideas will arrive in the Orient. Courage is required.

Professor Karl Heim of Germany said :

'It is regrettable that Germany has largely been responsible for poisoning the thought of the world in the materialistic sense, yet in Germany a great reaction against materialism is now operating.

'We have the following facts regarding the attitude of men who are non-Christian.

'(1) Attitude of Spengler. Spengler, who is the greatest philosophic influence in Germany at the present time, devoted the second volume of his great work to a discussion of the

person and work of Christ. The whole structure of Spengler's thought is spiritual.

'Moreover, books are now published against Darwinism that would have been impossible some years ago.

'(2) Influence of Einstein. Einstein insists on pure realism. He says that in order to see any subject one must have an eye for that particular reality.

'(3) Influence of biology. A biology has now appeared which returns to Aristotle, and emphasizes the idea of a final cause. In recent months three leaders of German medicine have made pronouncements on religion. While not accepting Christianity, they repudiate materialism, and say that a belief in God can be legitimately entertained. One of the leading German philosophers has recently said that until now we have believed only in an immanent finality, but now we find strivings to escape from this finality. The world must have a finality outside itself or it has no meaning. It is only a question of time till the new German thought makes itself felt.'

Mr R. H. Tawney of England said that

he could not share the complacency of many regarding the situation in Europe. Christianity is now faced by a new militant creed of communism, that challenges the whole scheme of Christian values. Certain facts should profoundly disturb us. (1) Religion is regarded as a creed of material success, which worships the power of the state. The state welcomes the churches so long as they can be its instruments without ever challenging its doings. As a result of this viewpoint the churches can no longer speak for the whole mass of Christianity. It must be realized that Christians are a small sect in an alien world. (2) There are people who accept the values of Christianity but are offended by the churches. They feel that the churches truckle to the power of this world. They distinguish between Christ and the representatives of organized Christianity. They consider that the churches do not stand for religion when it is dangerous.

Answering the question why the great mass of mankind is alienated from Christianity he said that it is not because of materialism in any dogmatic sense. It is due in part to the breaking down of old moral standards, and in addition,

to the fact that the Christian churches have left untouched much territory which should be occupied. They tolerate too much that they should attack. Christianity must either command the whole of life or none.

We have been too afraid of the paradoxical claims of Christ. The Church will be either overwhelmed or it will go on to control the whole social order.

Mr Harold A. Grimshaw of Geneva said that

as a man who has been in touch with the world-wide labour problems he had obtained knowledge in the International Labour Bureau which had operated a revolution in his spirit. Europe had exported miseries to the rest of the world. He instanced a case in which 94 per cent of the victims of forced labour died. Forced labour and other horrors still existed in many parts of the world. Christianity must be spread throughout the whole social order, and only in this form should it be exported to other lands.

Mr C. Oswald Lelean of Australia said that

a case had come under his notice in the Islands of the Pacific, into which 50,000 Indians were imported on an indenture system, and had to work for one shilling a day. The scandal was only righted as the result of the efforts of C. F. Andrews of India who said the thing must stop. He was cursed by the Government, but in time the conscience of the community became stricken. In two years the scandal ceased.

Dean Jorge Bocobo of the Philippines said :

'The Philippines is a Roman Catholic country of about twelve million people. Many of the educated men and women have been offended by the seemingly superficial practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and losing faith in the Church have lost faith in any sort of God. Religion as they have seen it is not vital enough to satisfy an intellectually trained man or woman. There are two groups in the Philippines—the older generation, which was educated under the Spanish religious system, and the younger generation, educated in American secular schools. The older generation constitutes the political, economic and social leadership, and is

for the most part sceptical of religion. The younger generation has had its education under strictly secular auspices. The radical change from a religious system of education to a purely secular one presents the greatest difficulty in the Philippine situation.'

Canon Charles E. Raven of England said :

'The underlying cause of the wave of secularization in Great Britain is to be found in the changes which during the last fifty years have radically affected every department of life. All standards have been challenged, and people have been left bewildered. For a time it seemed that these radical challenges would bankrupt the churches. For this the Church was largely to blame. The attitude of the Church as expressed in its art, music, intellectual presentation of its faith, and even its moral standards, has been definitely lower than the best thought of the time. Unless this is remedied, it is hard to see how we can meet the growing conviction that Christianity is no longer the pioneer in morals and religion. During the past five or six years there has been a remarkable movement from all sides of scientific thought toward a spiritual interpretation of life. At the same time, after a century of critical study Christian scholarship has been reaching a clear, coherent statement of the meaning of the life of Jesus Christ, more clear and more coherent than that attained by any recent generation. When we compare the values which have been developed by our scientific leaders with those developed by our biblical scholars we find that they are closely parallel. This seems to indicate a vision of God as Creator in nature and as revealed in the Incarnation which will give great comfort to those who have discovered that " man does not live by bread alone." '

Mr Gabino Rodriguez of Argentine said :

'Secularization is the great problem before us in the Argentine and Uruguay. For three centuries the Roman Catholic Church has dominated the political, social and religious life of these countries. The Church is now losing its hold, and people are swinging to the opposite extreme, abandoning religion entirely.

'These countries have been developing rapidly with the

consequent rapid increase in wealth and industrialism. This increasing wealth has tended to overpower spiritual values.

'Education in these countries is thoroughly materialistic. Uruguay has recently revised its text-books and taken out the name of God, and anything which suggests religion. They are against religion because they know only the Roman Catholic Church and think that religion means the enthroning of ignorance and superstition.'

Mr H. T. Marroquín of Mexico said :

'The situation in Mexico is much the same as in the Argentine. The Government of Mexico is challenging the Roman Catholic Church as no other government has done. For four hundred years the Church has had the opportunity to lift the moral and intellectual level of Mexico and has signally failed to do it.

'The present Mexican constitution in its regulation of religion adversely affects even the Protestant Church. We are not allowed to teach religion in the primary schools. In addition, in Mexico, there is a strike of the religious guides. The Roman Catholic priests have not submitted to the constitutional provision concerning registration, and so our children have no religious education in the churches. Over against these facts is to be put the remarkable awakening among the Protestants of a sense of responsibility for religious education in homes and schools, and the increasing demand for Bibles which is manifest all over the country. It is possible to teach religion in the secondary schools, and in the list of books recommended for secondary school libraries the Protestant edition of the Bible is placed at the head. This is because there are no comments upon the biblical text in this edition.'

Mr James S. Thomson of Scotland said :

'I am afraid that we are becoming too complacent and too inclined to congratulate ourselves. I am thinking of men whom I meet when I talk to them from soap-boxes on the corner of the street. When these men ask questions, they do not ask whether there is likely to be a synthesis between biology, psychology and religion, but they ask, "Has Jesus anything to say to the unemployed ?"

'The rising industrialism has made the great mass of men to be chiefly concerned with those things which they can touch and handle. The rapid growth of urban centres of population has brought multitudes of people out of touch with nature. All the powers with which they are in touch are powers which men can control, and this is producing a new type of industrial mentality. We do not solve the problems of this mentality by saying, "There is a side of life which you have not seen," but only by concretely expressing spiritual ideals in relation to the life which these men actually know.

'Unless our gospel takes into the area of its thought all that modern psychology and science have to give, in addition to that which comes from the mass of men, there is bound to be a widening rift between religion and the men we are anxious to reach.

'I am convinced that, though the majority of men are living outside the Church, they are still living under the shadow of the Church, and in all the crises of their lives they want the help the Church can give. There is still abroad in the land a Christian ethic expressing itself in love of home and brotherly goodwill, and it is by taking advantage of these expressions that we shall be able to lead men back into the fuller spirit of Christ.'

Mr Paul Sandegren of Sweden said :

'Since the Reformation Sweden has had a stiff State Church. The Church has been responsible for education and was the leader in the intellectual contribution which the Swedes made in the seventeenth century and in the revivals of the nineteenth century. When the revivals came the Church was not prepared to follow them up, and as a consequence the new Free Churches arose.

'The religious factor in our situation is weakened by the division in the churches, a division which is not alone in the field of religion, but also in the field of politics. In Sweden it is legally impossible for any one to belong to other than a Christian sect.

'Since the 'eighties the influence of Germany, of which Professor Heim spoke, has been strong, and some of our political leadership has consequently been outspokenly atheistic. When I went to India in 1915 I remember that

the mass of the common people were definitely opposed to religion. Eight years later when I returned I discovered that this opposition had largely died down.

'Till recently the public schools have belonged to the Church. A clergyman was chairman of the school board. By regulation now two hours of religious instruction each week is given in the public schools. In addition fifty to sixty hours of instruction are given in preparation for confirmation, and since 95 per cent of the Swedes are confirmed, religious knowledge is common.

'In reply to what has been said earlier, let me call attention to the fact that the Stockholm Conference dealt with many social problems, such as housing and unemployment, but the Church has not yet effectively handled these questions, and it must bear its share of responsibility for the secularizing influences of the last fifty years. This is because many of our best Christians think that the Kingdom of God has nothing to do with social problems, but only with the question of individual salvation. We have found it difficult to reconcile Christian emphasis on individual salvation and a social gospel. I am convinced that our Church has failed to sufficiently emphasize the social gospel.'

Dr Ralph E. Diffendorfer of America said :

'My impressions have been gained through a year of study and travel in Asia, with constant contacts with people from all walks of life. I have come to the conclusion that secular civilization is not a racial, national or religious problem ; that the dominance of material interests, the interest in war and the mechanical attitude toward life have been in man from the beginning, and are not the product of the West, of science or of Christianity. The problem is a human problem, and the approach to it must be on a simple human basis, and not on a basis restricted by conceptions of race or nationality.'

Dr Luther Allan Weigle of America said that

he thought Mr Jones, in his preliminary papers on Secular Civilization, exaggerated the situation in the United States, and he corrected certain figures which were in the paper. He did not believe that science was the mainspring of secular civilization, but that account must also be taken of national-

ism, which had become a religion, and of a certain confined thinking type of hedonism. It was not science which was the opponent of Christianity, but a nationalistic philosophy which was an illegitimate extension of science.

Miss Ethel W. Putney of Turkey said that

certain processes were going on in Turkey which were clearing the way for the spread of the Gospel. To the Turk religion had largely meant bondage, intellectual and national, and in his desire to erect a real State he had felt that religion must be thrown away ; hence the abolition of the Caliphate, of monasteries and of religious instruction in schools. There was real value in clearing away the superstitious surroundings of religion.

Dr William A. Noble of Korea said :

' We are agreed on the fact of the opposition of secular civilization to Christianity. It is much harder to suggest the cure. We need now some concrete statements looking toward the cure of this disease. This statement should be directed largely to youth, who are the greatest sufferers in this civilization. We should be candidly asking what they find in the Church, what they consider the failures of the Church and what are their expectations for it. On the basis of their answers we should draw up a programme which would challenge to new adventure in the Church. This programme must be one which will so apply to all the work of the world that in doing any particular piece of work one will find himself enjoying the same satisfactions which he enjoys in the worship of the Church. There was a time when the Korean church required those who were entering into its membership to give evidence of certain " fruits of the Spirit." We are not requiring so much now, but it seems to me that we should return to the earlier practice. In this return we will find an effective answer to secularism.'

Director D. Crommelin of Netherlands said :

' The West has been imposing a new industrial system on the East, and the East sees that the bulk of the profits arising from this system go out of the country. They are not content with this situation, and they are inclined to identify this

type of exploitation with Christianity and with the missionary enterprise. The Church must face this question: Have Christians the right to think that they can exploit the backward sections of the world at any cost and in any way, and overcome opposition to this exploitation by force if necessary? There is only one answer to this question, and the West might as well understand that in any conflict which arises out of the exploiting attitude the West will lose.'

Dr John A. Mackay of South America said:

'We are confusing two aspects of secular civilization. When an individual, group or nation pursues its own interests as an end, it is following an egoistic civilization. When an individual, group or nation pursues the good of other people, and endeavours to fulfil a vocation in so doing, it is following an altruistic civilization. In the altruistic aspects of our civilization we find ends which are identical with Christian ends. The passion for truth wherever it may be found, the willingness to sacrifice for that truth, even though any reference to God is left out of account, provide certain values which Christianity must not fight. In many of its aspects secular civilization is a disinterested pursuit of human welfare; the difficulty is that secular civilization does not provide a final dynamic in this pursuit. Those who seek the good of their fellows without reference to a religious motive find it difficult to hold to their original purpose.

'In Buenos Aires socialism is the controlling political influence, and it is there an uplifting and purifying influence, but the leaders of the socialist party confess that socialism has not been able to produce a self-sacrificing spirit. This spirit Christianity supplies by creating Christ-like personalities. A good man is one who not only does good and is good, but shows the capacity of creating goodness. The creation of goodness comes only when values are personalized. Christianity is the birth of the eternal Christ in the human soul, which then does good, becomes good and creates goodness. In this combination is the solution of our problem.'

Dr S. Guy Inman of Mexico said:

'The problem of secularism is an age-long and human problem, but in our age it presents several special features.

One of these is the exploitation carried on in these countries that produce the raw materials by the manufacturing countries that require them. Petroleum, for example, is at the present time one of the greatest mischief-makers in the world. There is no greater need than that of establishing spiritual friendship between producing and manufacturing countries ; otherwise violent reactions are bound to appear in the former.'

Dr B. Choné Oliver of India said :

' The treatment of the sick, which in early Christianity was a function of the Church, has in the course of time become secularized. This has been in some respects good, but on the other hand there are cases in which, as in the United States, according to recent statements, the ethics of the medical profession have fallen. It is necessary to emphasize the fact that the healing of the sick is an eternal expression of the compassion and love of God ; that being so, the Church must continue to carry on medical work as part of its essential programme.'

Canon Oliver C. Quick of England

drew attention to the fact that little had been said regarding the positive values of secular civilization. The latter had two aspects, an industrial and a scientific. Science in the form of disinterested quest for truth had become a religion for many people. This quest implied moral discipline. It was the Church's fault that secular science in this sense should be its enemy. The Church had been unwilling to interpret self-sacrifice intellectually. Intellectual self-sacrifice involved the fearless willingness to face the weather of fact. Men had to learn how to carry the Cross into the sphere of the intellect. The experience of the disciples on the road to Emmaus, who had to abandon the old truth in order to find it again in a new light, must be true in every age.

Miss Mary A. Dingman of England said :

' Christianity can meet the challenge of secular civilization. The countries sending and those receiving missionaries must advance together to capture the whole of life for Christ. Up to the present the missionary problem has been one of geographical extension. The new problem is essentially quali-

tative. The Christian conception of the sacramental idea of life must be carried into every region. It is regrettable how afraid many people are to think or express themselves honestly because of possible consequences. It is necessary for Christianity to face the present industrial situation of the world. English Christians, for example, dare not remain complacent in regard to the problem of unemployment and the dole system, which is essentially degrading. It was impressive to notice that the recent World Economic Conference made a number of pronouncements, as, for example, regarding the solidarity of mankind, which might have come straight out of the Gospels. The new front in our missionary outlook should bring back into Christianity the old passion and self-sacrificing spirit.'

Mrs Robert E. Speer of United States of America

emphasized the fact that there is very much in secular civilization that is of value. She drew attention to the way in which the conditions of life had been bettered and life itself enriched. In particular, the status of woman had been enormously lifted in recent centuries. A visit to a New England cemetery convinced one of how much longer women seem to live now in comparison with the olden days. Every aspect of life must be made holy and sacramental.

The Right Reverend J. J. Willis, Bishop of Uganda,

referring to what he called the 'Geneva' point of view as regards the world at large, drew attention to the fact that there are countries, such as Uganda, for example, where Government and missions have co-operated together for the betterment of the people. Whenever the missionaries pointed out the presence of an abuse it was immediately rectified.

Canon Charles E. Raven of England said :

'These rich and suggestive discussions have brought out many new sides of the problem. The first discovery we made was that this problem is not confined to any section of the world : all parts of the world have the same difficulties to face. The industrial movement and the new knowledge have created a new, fascinating and tyrannous way of life in which men have found it difficult to hold to the spiritual values

which we find in Jesus. It will be necessary for us to accept all the rich contribution of this new way of life, and for the Church to rise to these new discoveries of the human spirit. Secular civilization has done an immense work on behalf of social development and understanding. Mr Grimshaw's challenge to the gathering must be taken up, but the very fact that he had the opportunity to throw that challenge before us is a testimony of an advancing spirit in the Church. Secular civilization has provided a satisfying opportunity for personal development, not only in the pursuit of truth, but also in the providing of outlets for activities which supply all the values which religion was accustomed to provide. There is the possibility for every one now to enter upon a career of adventure, using the tools of the new industrialism and the new knowledge—a career that was previously offered only in the field of religion.

'We are in great danger of a complacency which thinks of Christianity in easy terms. Christianity is a religion of the Cross, and we need to face the sacrifice and cost involved in the real application of the idea of the Cross to human life. Our problem is to find how Christianity can baptize the new learning and the new social order with the spirit of Christ. We shall find that problem so tremendous that we shall lose all self-reliance, and as we deepen and enlarge our dedication to the service of the Cross we shall be set free from the complacency which is blind to the grandeur and the terror of our times.'

PART THREE

ADDITIONAL PAPERS

PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

ADDITIONAL PAPERS

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THE RELIGIOUS VALUES OF THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS?

ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D.

WHEN this volume was planned it was expected that the present chapter would be prepared by Dr Hendrik Kraemer, formerly of Java, now 'Deputed Officer of the Netherlands Bible Society for Scientific Work in Missionary Service.' Dr Kraemer had himself raised at one of the meetings in Jerusalem, in a very penetrating and impressive speech, the fundamental question as to the value of the values which the preliminary papers had found in the non-Christian religions. No one was better qualified than he to deal with this question both because of his sympathetic understanding of the non-Christian religions, and because of his clear apprehension of the unique and universal elements in Christianity. He had cheerfully undertaken the task assigned him, but a temporary set-back in health has prevented his accomplishing it. It has been necessary, accordingly, for some one else at the last moment to endeavour to take Dr Kraemer's place.

Happily, the missionary issue involved, in some of its aspects at least, has been stated by Dr Kraemer himself in a report of a meeting held in Cairo by the Continental delegates on their way to Jerusalem,

on 16th March 1928. I will quote Dr Kraemer's report :

' In the meeting of Continental delegates of the Jerusalem Meeting, held in the Y.M.C.A., Cairo, on 16th March, the papers on the relation of Christianity and the non-Christian systems came up for discussion.

' The debate was opened by the German delegates, who expressed frankly but candidly a feeling of uneasiness about the trend of the papers. They felt as if, generally speaking, the papers were drifting on the dangerous waters of syncretism and had insufficiently worked out the essential difference and absolute uniqueness of Christianity. With deep earnestness they emphasized that, however great our appreciation of the religious values and forces in other religions may be, we simply may not and can not move from the fundamental base and nerve of all real missionary activity, that God revealed Himself by His saving acts towards mankind in history and in an absolutely unique and unsurpassable way in Jesus Christ, who is *the* way to come to the Father, the Divine token of mercy and reconciliation. Jerusalem must have a clear and unambiguous message to the world on that point.

' The delegates of other Continental countries formulated in a somewhat different manner the same feelings. There were amongst them some who avowed to have been troubled in reading the pamphlets and who desired to see stated, in a more unequivocal way than seemed to be done by the papers, the fact that Christianity is a religion *sui generis* in the most pregnant sense of the word. However, full confidence was expressed that in reality the authors of the pamphlets did not differ from the fundamental standpoint as formulated in the meeting and a deep-felt appreciation was also expressed of the arduous devotion of the authors to the task of detecting the religious and moral values that possibly can be stated in non-Christian systems. Finally the meeting agreed on the following points, that may be worded in this way :

' 1. That the feelings and standpoint of the Continental delegates in this most vital matter should be brought to the notice of the Committee of the International Missionary Council under the form of a *communication.*

' 2. That the uneasiness about the eventual syncretistic rend of the papers must not be brought to the forum in

Jerusalem in the form of an accusation, but in the form of a question whether this way of tackling the problem will not unconsciously lead towards an undesirable and undesired syncretism.

'3. That most probably the papers have not shed sufficient light on the essence of Christianity as such, for three reasons: (*a*) the authors have been asked to estimate *the religious values* of the different systems; (*b*) two points that had to be separately treated in order to get the maximum of clearness, i.e. the essential nature of Christianity and of the other religions, and the problem of contacts, have become too much mixed up. The missionary sorely needs contacts, but he needs still more an absolute, joyful conviction about the Christian truth; (*c*) the authors as very zealous and devoted missionaries have stressed the point of contacts and similarities, just because they are so deeply founded in the Christian life and conviction.

'4. That it is not only a Christian duty but a Christian privilege to detect with joy and thankfulness all that is sublime and Godlike in the non-Christian systems, yea, that it must be our privilege to formulate this for the adherents of those systems better than they can do themselves. Yet the meeting has the conviction that the most sublime and heart-stirring elements, if they are to be ruled by Jesus Christ, have to be converted and regenerated in order to come to their complete fulfilment.'

The communication referred to in this report, expressing the feelings and standpoint of the Continental delegates, was prepared and presented at Jerusalem in the following form:

'A number of Continental delegates to the Jerusalem conference feel constrained to put into words the conviction which we hope is common to all delegates, namely, that all our mission work is based exclusively on the great acts of God for the redemption of mankind; and in particular the sending of His only begotten Son, His death on the Cross for the redemption of the world, His resurrection as the beginning of a new God-given life for redeemed humanity. We are the messengers of God to proclaim this redemption. The context of our message is the Father God, whose children we become

through our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the invitation to accept this salvation by faith. Therefore it is the main task of missions to work for the conversion of men, that is, their conscious break with their past life, the New Testament *metanoia* required of all Christians.

'In view of these facts, though fully acknowledging the spiritual values in the non-Christian religions, we are disquieted by the question whether the offer of salvation to non-Christians can be made by setting over against one another the spiritual values of the non-Christian and the Christian religions, the scheme followed by most of the papers presented to us.

'Further, we do not believe that the central task of the Christian missions can be accomplished by a so-called "Social Gospel," banding together all men of goodwill across the boundary lines of different religions in a common warfare against the evils of the world, indispensable and urgent though this warfare is.

'In view of the ominously rising tide of syncretism in the modern world and the fact that the missionary movement is inevitably bound up with modern civilization with its blessings and its curses, we regard it as an urgent duty for Protestant missions of all lands to stand firm on the basis of the way of salvation set forth in the whole Bible.'

The issue between the conception of Christianity as unique and universal and absolute and a syncretistic effort to combine all religions, Christianity and the non-Christian religions alike, in a new composite was clearly faced and answered in the discussion already reported in an earlier chapter and in the Message which the Council unanimously adopted. In so far as the Council could speak for the missionary enterprise and for the Christian Church, both in the older branches of it and on the mission field, there is to be no attempt at an amalgamated religion. The missionary enterprise will not be a search for a more adequate and satisfactory religion than Christianity. It will be the offer of the only Lord and Saviour Jesus

Christ to the whole world, and the common effort of Christian men of all lands and races to explore and experience His unsearchable riches, infinite and inexhaustible.

There remains, however, the question of attitude and approach on the part of Christianity to the non-Christian religions. And a part of this question is the problem raised by Dr Kraemer: 'What is the value of the religious values of the non-Christian religions discussed in the preliminary papers?'

No doubt some of the confusion and uneasiness which has been noted arose from the use of the word 'values,' an economic term taken over by theology during the past generation and having rather distinct associations and implications. And further perplexity sprang from the confinement of attention so largely to 'values,' with deliberate omission for the most part of reference to the items on the other side of the balance-sheet—the faults, shortcomings and defects. This omission was deliberate and intentional, as part of an effort to find the most effective and persuasive approach for the Christian message. And it is to be hoped that the result in the Message adopted by the Council and in the actual presentation of Christianity to the non-Christian peoples may prove ultimately to be a full vindication of the method pursued at Jerusalem.

But this will be the case only in proportion as we find and follow the way of truth with regard both to Christianity and to the non-Christian systems, and the discovery and pursuit of this way requires a consideration of the question of the value of the values which we discover in the non-Christian religions.

The question, happily, is not one of attitude either toward the non-Christian religions as religious systems

or toward their adherents. The Christian attitude for us is plain. It is the attitude in which the Bishop of Winchester, blind and far advanced in years, counselled Boniface to approach the souls to whom he was sent in Hesse, avoiding scrupulously all contemptuous and violent language, and trying above all things to show forth a spirit of moderation and patience. The Japanese delegates brought with them to Jerusalem a pamphlet of findings from the National Christian Council of Japan which dealt with this question of relation and attitude. Those findings set forth the 'points of superiority of Christianity as compared with other religions,' referring to Buddhism, Shintoism and Confucianism as follows :

'1. The conception of God as personal, making clear the ethical relation between God and man.

'2. Man not seeking to find God but God taking the initiative in seeking for man. Progress not through human effort but through God's condescension.

'3. The sense of personality. Respect for individuality and recognition of the absoluteness of the value of personality.

'4. Its scriptures, condensed into one volume, can conveniently be carried anywhere and understood by any one.

'5. Its superlative ethical sense. Its emphasis on clean living and new advance for the life of every day. Especially does it emphasize the purity of the home.

'6. Its stressing of social justice and social service.'

Then the Japanese pamphlet asked, 'How should these points of superiority be made known to men ?' and its first answer was :

'By avoiding comparison with other religions and positively and boldly declaring the essential elements

of the Christian faith, that is, a declaration of the whole Gospel of Christ.'

To these findings an appendix was added from the 'Findings of the Federation of Christian Missions in Japan,' 'on the presentation of the Christian Message in relation to the non-Christian faiths of Japan,' with the following counsel :

'The first great essential in the presentation of the Christian message is a firm grasp on the great spiritual realities for which Christianity stands and the ability to distinguish between what is real content and what is but the form and clothing of the Christian message.

'The second great essential is a sympathetic attitude and open-mindedness towards, and a real knowledge of, the non-Christian faiths.

'Our study of these non-Christian faiths should include not only what they were in their beginnings and historical evolution, but especially what they are to-day and what they are trying to become.

'All higher non-Christian religions are in one way or another quests on man's part for the enrichment of his life by establishing vital relationships with the divine.

'Probably the wiser approach would be that while, on the one hand, we recognize the existence of so-called non-Christian faiths and systems, we think, on the other hand, largely in terms of the individual adherents of these systems, realizing that there are enormous differences among them, and that some are far nearer the Christian conception and manner of life than others. These individuals might be classified roughly as follows :

'(*a*) The ignorant masses on whom popular Buddhism and Shinto still have a very strong hold and whose conception as to what the true enrichment of life is and what the divine might be are pathetically crude and inadequate. With them might be grouped the professional religionists who themselves either hold such views or who deal with their adherents in terms of popular Buddhism and Shinto.

'(*b*) Rare spirits among the old-fashioned Buddhists and Shintoists who have been little influenced by western life and civilization, but who as sincere seekers after truth have found a spiritual life of a noble and high order.

'(*c*) A large and growing group among Buddhists and Shintoists who have been greatly influenced by our expanding common world culture and by Christianity and who, though loyal to their own faiths, are often nearer the Christian position than they are to the traditional position of their fathers in the faith.

'(*d*) An even larger group, made up of all classes and degrees of education, who do not regard themselves as adherents of the faiths of their fathers or of any definite faith, but who are largely the product of our modern common world culture. This large group divides itself into two main sections: (1) Those who are religious and who in their whole outlook on life are often very near the Christian position. (2) Those who are essentially indifferent to religion in any form.'

This is bringing the whole matter down to a basis of human reality and defining the issue in terms of personal relationships between men and women. It must always ultimately come to this. But the question remains a real and just question: In what sense are these religious values of the non-Christian religions real values in themselves and in their relationship to the missionary effort to carry the Gospel to all the world?

They are real values in the witness they bear to great spiritual needs and to some elemental religious ideas. A memorandum presented to the meeting in Jerusalem by the Swedish Missionary Council noted four of these ideas.

(1) Wherever we meet religion it presents its claim of revealing the Eternal. There are religions which lack much

of that which we usually consider as indispensable to religion, even an idea of God. But there is no religion which does not attempt to reveal eternity in the world of time.

(2) As the second characteristic feature of all religion we might mention reverence, anxiety, judgment in view of eternity. The experience of the Eternal always brings with it seriousness and solemnity.

(3) The third characteristic feature of all religion is manifested in the step which with logical consequence results from the conditions described above, and the tension between them. The glory of the Lord reveals the unworthiness of man, the holiness of the Lord judges the sin of man, the wrath of God—the Eternal seen as a consuming fire—this and nothing else seems to be the result of the two aspects of religion which we have hitherto considered. 'No man can see the Eternal and live.'

Religion seeks to overcome the tension which it has created. It would build a bridge between the Holy One and the sinner, and it would create something that shall cover the unworthiness of man, it will point out ways and means for covering sin. This is the group of phenomena in the history of religion which is described as purification, atonement and sacrifices. Even though such outward means of atonement are less prominent in certain kinds of religion, especially in those of a mystical trend, the fact remains that we are here confronted with something that is essential in all religion.

(4) This leads us on to the fourth characteristic feature of all religion: it claims to establish real life-fellowship, life-unity between the Eternal and man, to infuse in man divine life. It is not sufficient that these two, the Divine and the human, stand in juxtaposition as two parties fundamentally different although reconciled to each other. The Eternal and man must not be contrasts. They must not be impenetrable to each other. All true religion aims at permeating the whole of human life with the Divine. God living in the soul, the soul united with God. This is the goal of religion.

On each of these points the Swedish statement held that Christianity distinguished itself in unique and qualitative ways from all other religions, and that there were other points in which it stood apart, with

nothing in common with them; but in these four respects there were intimations and recognitions in the non-Christian religions which had reality of value in themselves as well as in preparation for the fulness of the Christian truth.

They were real values also, as testifying to the spiritual view of life and the world, and as providing in their measure a resistance to the secular and mechanical conceptions which are threatening to dominate human thought, and which are discussed in Professor Rufus M. Jones's paper and in the report of the section meeting at Jerusalem on Secular Civilization.

They are real values in so far as they remind us of forgotten or overlooked values in Christianity. It must be candidly recognized that the Hindu, for example, says the same thing of the values of Christianity. Those Christian conceptions, he holds, are to be found too, now that he is set looking for them, in his own sacred books. Well, the issue here is simply an issue of fact. And the Christian is ready to abide by it. He believes that all good is in Christ and that there is good in Christ that is nowhere else, and he awaits with confidence the ultimate result of the comparison between Christ and the riches of Christ and all the values of the other religions.

These values are real values to the missionary enterprise in so far as they provide a meeting-place of common accord. Here again we need to keep in mind the fact that the problem is not so much one of the comparison of systems as of the meeting of persons. And there must be some place where persons meet. The Christian and the Moslem meet in the truth of the unity and spirituality of God; the Christian and the Confucianist in the truth of

the moral law as the will of Heaven. Without a meeting-place how can two set off upon a common journey ?

And these values are true values whenever they are the truth. Truth is truth wherever it is found. It belongs to and is part of Him who said, ' I am the Truth.' All goodness is God's goodness and all truth is God's truth. The Council rejoiced, therefore, in its Message to ' recognize as part of the one Truth that sense of the Majesty of God and the consequent reverence in worship, which are conspicuous in Islam ; the deep sympathy for the world's sorrow and unselfish search for the way of escape, which are at the heart of Buddhism ; the desire for contact with Ultimate Reality conceived as spiritual, which is prominent in Hinduism ; the belief in a moral order of the universe and consequent insistence on moral conduct, which are inculcated by Confucianism ; the disinterested pursuit of truth and of human welfare which are often found in those who stand for secular civilization but do not accept Christ as their Lord and Saviour.'

But when all this has been said, it must be said also, in the interest of the truth itself, that these values need to be honestly qualified.

These values are not a supplement to Christianity, as though, to borrow Paul's words, Christ needed anything from any one. We find when we come with Christianity to the other religions of the world, and place Christianity in comparison with them, that Christianity has all the good of other religions. There is good and truth in these religions which we joyfully acknowledge, which has enabled them to survive and given them their power ; but there is no truth or good in them which is not found in a purer and fuller form

in Christianity. Hinduism teaches the immanence of God; Mohammedanism the sovereignty of God; Buddhism the transitoriness and yet the solemn issues of our present life; Confucianism the dignity of our earthly relationships and of human society. But are not all these truths in Christianity also? It is so with whatever of good we find anywhere. To quote a missionary poem:

> We with reverent minds searching the lore
> Of ancient days, find buried here and there
> Fragments of precious truths and, piecing them
> Again with reverent minds, construct a Form
> And Body of the Truth—when lo! the whole
> Grows to the likeness of our own dear Christ.

There is no truth anywhere which is not already in Christ, and in Christ in its fullest and richest form. Even the transformed Hinduism of the Vedanta offers only portions of what we already have in Him. As Mr Slater says: 'The Christian Gospel offers all that the Vedanta offers, and infinitely more. So true is it that every previous revelation flows into the revelation we have in Christ, and loses itself in Him. Christ includes all teachers. All "other masters" are in Christ. We do not deny the truths they taught; we can delight in all. We can give heed to all the prophets; but every truth in every prophet melts into the truth we have in Christ. And Christ tells us that life, not death, is what our souls are made for. That is His distinctive message to the non-Christian world. To be made one with the Divine, "not in the dull abyss of characterless nonentity, lapsing from the personal down to the impersonal, from the animate to the inanimate, from the self back to the mere thing"; but in the reciprocal embrace of con-

scious love, mutually realized and enjoyed—that is the true and highest *bhakti-yoga*—knowing even as we are known.'

And not only are all the truths of the other religions in Christianity, but they are balanced and corrected as they are not in the non-Christian religions. Hinduism teaches that God is near, but it forgets that He is holy. Mohammedanism teaches that God is great, but forgets that He is loving. It knows that He is a king, but not that He is a father. Buddhism teaches that this earthly life is fleeting, but it forgets that God sent us to do work, and that we must do it while it is day. Confucianism teaches that we live in the midst of a great framework of sacred relationships, but it forgets that in the midst of these we have a living help and a personal fellowship with the eternal God, in whose lasting presence is our home. What the other religions forget, or never knew, Christianity tells us in the fulness of its truth.

When men speak to-day, as it is well that they should, of the treasure of their racial or religious inheritance and its distinctive values, and when the effort is made to state these in definite and precise terms, it is invariably found that so far as they are values at all they are values of Christ, rays of His light, fragments of His wealth.

It must be recognized also that the values of a religion are not separable from its other elements and features, or from their place in the midst of their surrounding conditions and limitations. A truth may be but a half-truth, requiring a supplement which its content does not supply. It may be tied to error, intellectual or moral or social, which annuls its virtue. Furthermore, identity of language may

cover wide diversity of essential ideas.[1] And also it is the unmistakable lesson of the history of religion that these values of the non-Christian systems are sterile. Truth that affects social character and life roots in personality. The unique power of Christianity is found not in its truth about God but in its true and living God, not in its true doctrine about Christ or from Christ about life, but in Christ as Himself the Truth and the Life.

All this and much more needs to be kept in mind in determining the value of spiritual values, and especially in making comparison between Christianity and the other religions as the preliminary papers do, as indeed must inevitably be done in offering Christ and the Gospel to people who already have their own religious or secular views. The paper of the Swedish Missionary Council comments on this :

> It is useless to attempt a comparison on individual points, and for various reasons : (*a*) the different religions are often incommensurable. What seems to be a corresponding idea may hold such different place and significance that an effort to compare them leads to violation. (*b*) Comparison often induces to injustice since one is often tempted to compare one's own ideal with the *reality* of the other religion. (*c*) In comparing one is generally tempted to overlook the subjectivity of the valuation, e.g. when it is stated that Christianity excels Buddhism by its activity. But what is it that proves activity to be superior ? This is at the most *our* valuation. But if we were to carry on missions only in order to promote activity in the world, we might justly be blamed for trying to urge our own views on others. (*d*) Comparison on individual points easily leads to a consideration of Christianity from the point of view of *quantity*, to a valuation on the basis of relativity (it has " more " of a certain idea than other religions, it stands " higher," is " better " than these).

[1] Morgan, William, *The Nature and Right of Religion*, pp. 22–4, on the different conceptions of redemption in Brahmanism and in Buddhism and between these and Christianity.

'Attention must rather be concentrated on the point of view of *quality*, on the central religious value of Christianity and then with nothing else to present than *the new relation to God through Christ*. The gift which missions have to bring to the non-Christian nations is *Christ Himself*, or, using the phraseology of Saint Paul, the missionary, "Jesus Christ and Him crucified"; *the Cross*, which proclaims the love of God —not to the righteous, but to sinners—and which *is* the love of God; God, who does not claim our sacrifices but sacrifices Himself and thereby regenerates us to live in Him.

'If missions seek to *conquer* the world for Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to sacrifice Himself, conquest and service are fused in one.'

Here we have stated with simple Christian candour the fundamental assumption of Christian missions, the reasoned conclusion of comparative religion and the plain fact of experience on which the new churches of the mission field and the faith and life of their members are built, namely, that with all the values fairly recognized and weighed, Christianity is better. Why should there be any hesitation about our saying this? It is exactly what the New Testament said about Judaism. It is the keynote of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with its setting forth of 'a better hope,' 'a better testament,' 'a better covenant,' 'better promises,' 'better sacrifices,' 'a better resurrection.' If Christianity is not better than every other religion, what right have we to extend it, and on what rational or defensible ground do the new churches and the faith of their members rest?

And not only is Christianity better. It is best. This is the firm declaration of the Message of the Council. Christ is unique and absolute. He is 'God incarnate, the final, yet ever unfolding, revelation of the God in whom we live and move and have our being.' Christianity is unique and superior, its value

is in a class above all other values in its ethical essence. As William Morgan says in his fresh and modern appraisal:

'What gives to Christianity its peculiar stamp is its radically ethical character. Christianity interprets life and interprets the universe in terms of the highest ethical values. While it does not fail to recognize the right of rationality and beauty, it is, above all, justice and mercy and love and truth that it establishes at the heart of being. It affirms all genuine values, giving the primacy to the ideal, and among the ideal to the moral; and so doing, it affirms the eternal worth of our human life and the eternal importance of our human tasks.

'In India we are confronted by a valuation fundamentally different. To the world of our experience and to human life as we know it on earth, all value is denied. The world, including separate personalities, is *maya*, illusion, and there is nothing real except Brahma. And what is Brahma? According to the Upanishad thinkers, he (or it) can be described only by negatives. If the idea has any positive content it is to be found in contemplative thought—that that is impersonal and free from all change and striving. Union with Brahma, which is the goal of redemption, comes through a series of disciplines calculated to detach the self from the world and all its interests, destroy the sense of separate individuality and wither action at its source. The will to live being killed, the self, escaping from the law of *karma* and the sorrowful, weary wheel of transmigration, enters Nirvana.

'This, so far as empirical existence is concerned, so pessimistic outlook, Gautama inherited and made more explicit. In rejecting the idea of union with Brahma, he practically eliminated religion from his system, leaving his system a bare means of deliverance from the intolerable evil of life. His most valuable contribution was a body of moral teaching of singular elevation and his own high moral seriousness.

'In the later Buddhism the religious element was restored. Gautama himself became to his followers an object of religious veneration, and was even interpreted, in a way that reminds us of the Logos doctrine, as an effluence from the eternal and all-pervading world-soul. More important religiously was the introduction of the idea of divine helpers called *Bodhisattvas*.

These helpers are not, properly speaking, Gods ; they are men who, ready for Nirvana, have renounced it in order to become the teachers and saviours of suffering humanity ; but they exercise the functions of a god. To them the layman looks for salvation and hopes to join their ranks in the distant future. As a result of this development, a new emphasis is placed on the disposition of pity and love towards all creatures. In the older Buddhism a man's thoughts were mainly occupied with the task of winning his own deliverance from the sore cycle of birth, death and rebirth.

'Although in this new or Mahayana Buddhism there are obvious points of contact with Christianity, the distance between the two religions is not substantially lessened. The pessimism with respect to life and its values, in which all the higher religion of India has its source, is not overcome. If the ethical is given a high place, in the last resort it holds this place only as a means to a redemption which transcends it. It is not, as in Christianity, established on the throne of being. The two religions rest on opposed valuations.

'With Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Platonism and Islam Christianity has not a little in common. All can be described as more or less ethical religions. In conservative Judaism, however, so much is retained that is merely particularistic and national that its claim to universality is subject to serious deduction. Between liberal Judaism and Christianity the difference often narrows itself down to questions of speculative theology. Islam is only half ethical. Its God, notwithstanding the attributes of justice and mercy ascribed to him, is capricious and remorseless—the God of the relentless desert that holds you in its grip and may destroy you at any moment.

'Among all the religions that have appeared in history only of Christianity can it be said that it is fundamentally and consistently ethical. That is its greatness—that and the fact that it has at the heart of it the supreme personality of Jesus. Have we any outlook beyond it ?'

Christianity is superior and unique and absolute in its idea of God. It 'has such a conception of God as no other religion has attained ; and what is more, it proclaims and brings to pass such an experience of God as humanity has never elsewhere known. . . .

The God of Christianity is one, the sole source, Lord and end of all. He is holy, being in Himself the character that is the sole standard for all beings. He is love, reaching out to save the world from sin and fill it with His own goodness. He is wise, knowing how to accomplish His heart's desire. He is Father in heart, looking upon His creatures as His own and seeking their welfare. All this truth concerning Himself He has made known in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, in whom His redemptive will has found expression and His saving love has come forth to all mankind. . . . The conception of God with which Christianity addresses the world is the best that man can form or entertain.' [1]

It is this transcendent superiority of the gift of God in Christ that warrants the missionary enterprise and justifies the men and women who have come to Christ from other religions in all lands. Christianity ' has the right to offer itself boldly to all men, and to displace all other religions, for no other religion offers what it brings. It is the best that the world contains. Because of its doctrine and experience of the perfect God, it is the best that the world can attain. Its contents can be unfolded and better known, but they cannot be essentially improved upon. At heart, Christianity is simply the revelation of the perfect God, doing the work of perfect love and holiness for His creatures, and transforming men into His own likeness, so that they will do the works of love and holiness toward their fellows. Than this nothing can be better. Therefore, Christianity has full right to be a missionary religion, and Christians are called to be a mission people.' [2]

[1] Morgan, William, *A Study of Christian Missions*, pp. 10, 11, 18.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 19 ff.

No voices have ever proclaimed all this more convincingly than the voices of those who in their own life and experience have faced and answered the question of religious values. The biographies of these men and women are full of unanswerable personal testimony. It was such testimony that made the speeches of the women delegates at Jerusalem so convincing. The heavy emphasis of our time upon the principle of nationalism has led very naturally to a new tenacity of national and racial and religious traditions and to a tendency to glory in all that has entered into the national or racial past. There is something very worthy in this loyalty. But in the end the attitude of the true and whole-minded believer will doubtless be the same as St Paul's. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, of the intellectual and spiritual aristocracy, possessor of all the spiritual values of Judaism. 'But what things were gain to me these I counted loss for Christ. Yea, I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord.' This was Paul's attitude toward values. Dr Nicol Macnicol refers to this principle in moving language, which I venture to repeat, at the end of the supplement to his paper on 'Christianity and Hinduism':

'Finally, we need not, I think, stay to deal with questions of the continuity of Christianity in relation to Hinduism and of Christianity's superiority. Whether there is a gulf between the messages of the religions or not is a matter largely to be determined by the experience of the Hindu who has come to Christ, and his experience depends, in large measure, on whether he is what William James calls a twice-born man or a once-born one. Pandita Ramabai was aware of the deep waters to be crossed and of her need to be carried over them by the Divine Power; Narayan Vaman Tilak passed over it, maybe, scarcely wetting his feet. But both would freely

admit that the Divine Grace met them and led or carried them across. And this, surely, is the key to the question of "superiority." The man of the West can never maintain that he has climbed further to God than the man of the East. The truth is wholly otherwise. But God has come to meet him all the way. God and the grace of God are in Christ as nowhere else in the universe. That we affirm. That seems to be what an Indian delegate pointed out in the discussion. "The least in the Kingdom of Heaven"—the poorest creatures among us Christians of the West, poor in our lack of insight into religious truth compared with many Hindus, and in our lack of the natural *pietas*, the spirit of submission and acceptance, that is so often to be seen in them—"the least in the Kingdom of Heaven" who has obtained a glimpse of God as He is seen in the face of Christ Jesus is greater than any on whom that light has never shone. But it is a "superiority" that can only humble him in the dust.'

It is just this attitude of St Paul's which was impossible for the pride of the Jews, and it is hard for all racial pride to-day. As Edwyn Bevan writes in a paper which the British delegation brought to Jerusalem:

'It is a very bitter saying for the Indians that "salvation is of the Jews." They are so sure that India has the primacy in things spiritual. They cling more passionately to such a belief because they feel humiliated by their political position. . . . But I am afraid for *all* peoples a genuine entrance into the Christian society means some painful sacrifice of pride, and we cannot make the narrow gate a wide one. Indians see plainly enough what a sacrifice of pride Englishmen have to make if they are going to be genuinely Christian, adopting the attitude of humble service instead of standing on their superior power. But Indians also have to make a great sacrifice of pride, if they are going really to bow to the Hebrew Jesus as the supreme Lord. The Jews, one might have thought, at any rate need not make such a sacrifice of pride; but they have to make perhaps the most painful of all. Salvation is of the Jews, but they have to acknowledge that Judaism all these centuries has failed to see the salvation.'

From his new Christian point of view Paul saw more clearly than the Jews the true spiritual values of their inheritance. Even so it is Christians who ought to see and appreciate all true spiritual values existing anywhere, and glory in them. It is a hard question of fact, however, as to whether the exaltation of these values helps men and women to come to Christ. In many cases it has done so. They have been drawn to Christ by finding in Him the many things which they prize most, in their perfect fulness. But, on the other hand, there are men and women who come to Him for what they have never found or known even in part. For these Macmurray and Bevan in the British papers set forth one aspect of missionary policy. Mr Bevan wrote :

'One great question of principle is : How far should we present to non-Christian peoples what in Christianity is *like* their own traditions ; how far what is *unlike* ? There is a tendency in some quarters to recommend Christianity to the Indians by making it as like Hinduism as possible. On the other hand, it is just the elements in Christianity which are unlike anything else in Hinduism that Indians most need, as Tennyson said of his friend,

> He supplied my want the more
> That his unlikeness fitted mine.'

And Mr Macmurray wrote :

'There is first a general danger in comparing Christianity with other religions and picking out for emphasis what they have in common. That is all right in a university classroom, or in merely historical study. As a basis of policy it seems to me to be gratuitously weak. The essential question is to discover what Christianity has to give to the world that no other religion can give—in any degree. The difference has to be one of kind. Unless Christianity is essentially and radically different from other religions ; unless there is some sense in which it is just right and they are just wrong ; then there isn't much to be said for the missionary drive.

'One of the profoundest remarks which I have come across about religion is in Collingwood's *Speculum Mentis*. He says that religion reached its climax in Christ; and in doing so it ceased to be religion. Using religion in this sense—and it is the only sense in which it can be used when one studies comparative religion—he seems to me to be just right. Much that belongs to religion in this sense permeates what we call Christianity—both in doctrine, spiritual outlook and organization. And I have a conviction that the points which the various world religions have in common with Christianity are in large measure the points which are not specifically Christian, but merely religious.'

But our policy must take account of the others also, like Nehemiah Goreh and many another to whom Christ was not so much the overthrowal and reversal as the fulfilment and completion. But here, too, there is a problem and a promise with regard to the values whose value we have been considering. Of the problem Mr Bevan writes:

'Another great question is connected with the new elements brought into the Christian tradition by peoples who enter the Church with previous traditions of their own. This may be an enrichment of the Church; in our western Christianity there are elements which the Church took over and incorporated from Greek and Roman culture. But such assimilation can be safe only when accompanied by a very active instinct of rejection. The Gnostics tried to combine Christianity with pagan Hellenistic religion, very much as some people would like to combine Christianity with Hinduism. And the Church had a life-and-death battle to expel Gnosticism. It may often be difficult to say whether some things which have come into the Christian tradition from outside are an enrichment or an adulteration. I think this applies to one element in the Christian tradition which Indians are apt to hail as specially akin—Christian mysticism. It is akin; it came into Christianity from the older Greek paganism, which, as we have seen, resembled Hinduism; it came from Neoplatonism by way of "Dionysius the Areopagite" and got established in the tradition of the mediæval Church. Is it

to be regarded as an enrichment? Or as an adulteration? It is sometimes said that a satisfactory commentary on St John's Gospel could best be written by an Indian. No doubt an Indian Christian might write an admirable commentary, but I doubt whether his Indian tradition would not tend to mislead him, as much as it helped him. St John's Gospel, like all the Christian scriptures, is Hebraic at the core.'

The values of the old religions need conversion. They, too, must be washed in the blood of the Lamb, pass through the agony of the Cross and rise again in the resurrection.

And this is the promise. Only so can the old values survive. Mr Hung's vivid and penetrating judgment has been quoted on pp. 344–5. He sees the ancient treasures already lost. And Mr Macmurray has put this in striking words:

'These religions are going to be smashed anyhow—perhaps not quickly, but surely, and what is going to do it—indeed is already doing it—is modern science, modern commerce and modern political organization. These are the things that the East wants from us: and on the whole it does *not* want our Christianity. It will have them and they will destroy its religions, its customs and its social organizations. It doesn't seem to me to be really worth while to attempt to save from the wreck what seems to us good and valuable in the older non-Christian civilizations. Why all this archæologism? When the old systems of life have become a mere memory—as Rome and Greece have for us—then all that is of permanent value in them will be ripe and available for educational purposes. At the moment the good and the bad are so thoroughly intertwined, so unified in a common concrete way of life, that the destruction of the system must precede the rescue of its valuable elements.'

But the time element is not so sharply edged. The movement is a living process. Christianity enshrines in its present forms a great deal that it took over from the thought and life which it met in the

world. It is now to repeat this work of redemption. The values of the non-Christian religions are to be salvaged by the grace of Christ and baptized into Him. Only so can they survive. Their value, like all other values, is as material for Him, that the works of God may be manifested in the world.

THE EVANGELISTIC DUTY OF CHRISTIANITY

John A. Mackay, M.A., D.Litt.

DOES the Christian religion possess the message which the world needs? If it does, what elements of inherent superiority in that message make imperative its proclamation to all mankind? By what means can attention to the Christian message be most effectively secured? The present paper will be an attempt to answer these questions. The answers attempted will constitute an affirmation of the duty of Christian evangelism, and will offer, at the same time, a simple analysis of its task.

I. THE CENTRALITY OF CHRIST

'Our message is Jesus Christ.' In these simple but impressive words the men and women who met last Eastertide on the Mount of Olives crystallized their conception of the message of Christianity to the world. Emphasizing thus the centrality of Christ in Christianity, and identifying the Christian Gospel with the personality of the Christian Lord, they were but interpreting the testimony of twenty centuries of experience. Christian saints and thinkers, so far apart as the Church Father Irenæus and the Sadhu Sundar Singh, express in almost identical terms their view of the uniqueness of Christ as a religious value. When the former was asked by the followers of Marcion: 'What new thing did

Jesus bring ? ' he answered : ' He brought all that was new in bringing Himself.' And when a Hindu professor of philosophy asked the Christian Sadhu of our day : ' What have you found in Christianity which you did not find in the religions of India ? ' the reply was : ' I have found Jesus Christ.' Not His teachings about God and man, not even the uniqueness of His religion, but He Himself, in whom we discover ' what God is and what man through Him may become,' is the quintessential element in Christianity and its unique message to the world. Christ is the religious value of intrinsic and absolute worth which Christianity has and which the world needs.

The world's need of Christ and its feeling after Him find vocal expression in a variety of ways. It is much more than literary fashion or mere intellectual curiosity that causes so many distinguished men of letters in our day to write each one his own ' Life of Christ.' No matter that many of those ' Lives ' are little more than the autobiographies of the biographers : the latter wrote them in obedience to an irrepressible spiritual urge. ' I too have seen Jesus,' says Henri Barbusse the French communist, on the frontispiece of his book entitled *Jésus*. ' I love Him and hold Him to my heart and am willing to dispute with others the possession of Him.' In his more recent book *Les Judas de Jésus* he expresses the view that Jesus has been betrayed by his friends and followers adown the ages. We may scarcely be able to recognize the Christ of the Gospels and the Church's faith in the communistic garb in which His French admirer clothes Him ; but this only enhances the significance of the fact that the man, who, more than any European writer outside Russia,

has been the incarnation of post-war iconoclasm, should become fascinated by the personality of Jesus and perceive in Him a creative element for the reconstruction of society.

Dr Stanley Jones and others have been telling us lately how many of the best minds in India and the East are coming under the spell of Christ. These Orientals elbow their way to Him through the surrounding press, 'wanting to see Jesus.' They distinguish clearly between Him and the Christian civilization of the West. They disentangle Him from institutional Christianity. They attempt to introduce reforms into their own religions to bring them into closer harmony with the spirit and teaching of Jesus. There are Hindus and Mohammedans who apply the attribute of Christ-likeness to Mahatma Gandhi, their venerated leader. Certain kinds of conduct they call 'unchristian.' They judge the sins of Christendom by the standard of Christ, for they know of nothing higher. In an address delivered at the All-India Council of the National Missionary Society of India, held at Allahabad on 28th December 1927, that distinguished Indian Christian, Dr A. J. Appasamy, cited a number of instances in support of his thesis that India is moving towards Christ. Among these instances were the following: 'A Hindu Sannyasi has written a life of Christ in beautiful Tamil verse. An enlightened Hindu pundit, whose discourses on Hindu philosophy are widely read and appreciated, sets forth to explain the significance of the Sermon on the Mount. A young Hindu professor of philosophy in the course of an address recently delivered to a group of Hindu students goes out of his way to pay his tribute of praise to Jesus Christ.'

The eyes of men everywhere are wistfully focused upon Christ. Both in the East and in the West, amid the instability, the pain and the yearning that characterize our modern world, He begins to stand out as the 'Desire of all Nations.' Even in Latin America which an eminent South American recently called the 'most irreligious part of the western world,' and which may very well be regarded as the most perfect contemporary example of a purely secular civilization, a new interest in Christ is springing up. Not long ago, in an historic session of the Mexican Congress, when the drastic policy of the government towards institutional Christianity in Mexico was under discussion, a prominent member of the house and an ardent supporter of the government's religious policy uttered a glowing panegyric of Jesus, which has been quoted far and wide throughout the American continent. In the course of contrasting Him with much that had been done in His name, he exclaimed: 'Has the world ever known anything more beautiful, anything more revolutionary than the Gospel of Christ?' So true it is that neither the passage of time nor the violence of controversy can rob of its sweetness that immortal phrase 'The Gospel of Jesus Christ.'

More recently still, that brilliant *littérateur* Don Ricardo Rojas, present head of the great University of Buenos Aires, wrote a book entitled *The Invisible Christ.* In that volume, which, by the way, is the first book ever written on Christ by a front-line literary man in Latin America, the author calls himself an œcumenical Christian, through belonging neither to the Roman Catholic nor to the Protestant communion. He declares that what the modern world needs is a new spiritual advent of the Christ.

'Humanity,' he says, 'goes on its way distracted, like the incredulous Cleophas on the Emmaus road in the gloaming, and perchance the Risen One is coming in an invisible form to give a new message to souls.'

Jesus Christ is, therefore, not only the soul of Christianity and its unique religious value: His universality is becoming more and more apparent to thoughtful men around the world. He has no serious rival on the field. Men are looking to Him in such a way that Christians have a greater opportunity and a greater responsibility than ever before to share with the world their knowledge and experience of Him. It would be sheer treason and disaster if this fact did not stir the Christian Church to the depths, so that she should give herself to exploring more fully what she possesses in her Lord and be transformed by the fresh vision into His love letter to all mankind.

II. THE RICHES OF CHRIST

What values do we find in Jesus Christ that are infinitely superior to the values of other faiths? What aspects of Him yield the deepest inspiration to missionary service? What contact with Him will banish for ever from the missionary movement that 'modern disease and weakness from which faith suffers,' that 'unlimited relativity' which Troeltsch calls a 'degeneration of the idea of tolerance'? Let us attempt a brief exploration into the riches of Christ.

The Perfect Pattern

In the first place, we have in Jesus Christ a perfect pattern for life. He is the divine ideal of manhood

realized in human flesh, the new, the archetypal Man. No higher qualities have ever appeared or been conceived than those which inhere in His personality. Christ-likeness is the highest attribute that can be predicated of any human being. A Christ-like world, a world, that is to say, in which the Christ spirit shall govern the lives and relations of men, will always be the highest ideal of human society, and the conscious goal of their endeavours who have beheld the face of Christ and heard His ' Follow me.'

This perfect human personality who taught that the holy and righteous God of the Prophets was also the Father of men, and that God's Kingdom was both present and to come, sowing in men's minds the revolutionary idea of spiritual progress, we commonly call the ' Jesus of History.' It is only fair to say that He is very largely the discovery of our time. The ' Back to Christ ' movement, whatever its limitations, has undoubtedly saved Christianity in the modern world. A hundred and fifty years of patient study of the Gospel narrative and its central Figure, carried on by the affection of some investigators and the hate of others, provided society and the Church with a personal conscience and a norm of character and conduct, at the very time when these were most needed.

How shall we appraise the value of this aspect of Christ ? In the character of the ' historical Jesus ' and in His revolutionary teaching, in that part of it especially which we call the ' Sermon on the Mount,' there shines forth in majesty the new law for man's life. The appeal to follow Him, meaning to imitate His example, and the appeal to obey His teaching, are the surest means of shaking men out of their complacency. Such appeals bring them face to

face with the imperatives of duty and the grandeur of moral heroism. They awaken a sense of sin and insufficiency. They create a sense of responsibility for the realization of the Christ ideal in individual and social life. The modern evangelist, whether at home or abroad, cannot make too much of the ethical and social implications of his vision of Christ. The presentation to mankind of a perfect type of life and a perfect rule of action will not bring men salvation and new life ; but it will bring them salvation's indispensable forerunner, a deep spiritual yearning and unrest, without which salvation in any true sense will never be sought. We must give in our time a deeper content to what our fathers called 'Law preaching.' We must preach and apply the Law of Christ to life in its wholeness and complexity. This divine Law is more 'exceeding broad' than ever occurred to the ancient Hebrew bard for whom God's law was his 'meditation day and night,' or even to our glorious forerunners in missionary service. It will prove, if we are faithful, the 'Schoolmaster' that men of all faiths and opinions need to bring them to Christ the Saviour. Where is the other religious figure the sight of whom is capable of making a modern man feel uneasy about his life ? Who else but Christ will give him an ideal to pursue that can satisfy the moral consciousness of the world ?

The All-Powerful Transformer of Character

Christ is much more, however, than the archetypal Man ; experience proves that He is the all-powerful transformer of character. His personality is not

merely normative: it is also redemptive. It is luminous and points out the way; it is curative and heals the plaints of the wayfarer. As surely as Jesus Christ said 'Follow me,' He said also 'Come unto me,' and for those who 'follow' as for those who 'come' there is an equally enriching experience. They, moreover, who 'follow' Him will 'come' unto Him, and they who 'come' unto Him will 'follow' Him. Man's perfect example is also his Saviour.

Just as Christianity possesses a unique and universal standard for life which Christians should fearlessly proclaim to all men, it possesses likewise a unique experience which it is equally obliged to propagate and share. This experience has all the marks of uniqueness and universality. It is the experience of spiritual rebirth, produced through contact with Christ, as a result of which God becomes a living, energizing reality in the life of a man. The power of Christ to transform life is admirably described in a passage that occurs in Harold Begbie's recent book *Broken Lights*. If a man approaches Christ with no other desire in his heart than to love Him and to become like Him, then 'Christ,' so the quotation runs, 'answers with the bestowal of His divine power—a strange power, a power unlike any other power on the earth, for it enables a man to escape out of himself and to become radiant with a happiness which has no touch in it at all of natural selfishness. It is a power which can save a drunkard from his thraldom, change the whole atmosphere of an unhappy home, turn an idle and unhappy woman of fashion into a rejoicing servant of the poor, and rescue the harlot from a form of existence which is visibly destructive of both body and soul.'

Christianity as it faces the world has no greater missionary asset than this glorious empirical fact that unreserved submission to Christ changes life, gives certainty about God and leads to communion with Him. This, we take it, is the central truth emphasized by Stanley Jones in his two admirable books, *The Christ of the Indian Road* and *Christ at the Round Table.*

To come face to face with Jesus Christ as He is revealed in the Gospels and to yield one's self to Him results in a 'numinous' experience, as Otto would call it. In that experience God and Christ are found to be inseparably, indistinguishably joined. Peace, certainty and new strength flow into a man; joy and enthusiasm flow out of him. The loyal effort to imitate Christ's life and obey His words will not alone give that experience, but they will make the need of it felt and the experience itself an object of intense desire. In this connexion the words of Professor Deissmann are worth pondering: 'We should guard ourselves,' he says, 'against the temerity of thinking that we can copy Jesus. The following of Jesus consists less in attempting to imitate His experience than in submitting ourselves to Him.'[1]

Thus far, we have considered Christianity as offering to mankind a standard of ethical perfection and a vitalizing experience. This standard is intuitively recognized to be absolute, while the universal validity of the experience can be demonstrated by the fact that it has been shared by men and women of all ages, of all races and of all social classes. In this respect Christianity can be regarded as something to be realized in both the outer and inner life of men.

[1] *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, p. 95.

But it is still more than that : it is revelation no less than realization. It relates our pursuit of an ideal and our experience of renewal to what is most ultimate : God and His universal plan.

The Incarnate Revelation of God

To what we have already said about Christ we therefore add that He is the incarnate revelation of God.

We are now obviously in the much-decried region of theology, but this realm must be entered if we would know the full riches of Christ for the world. We cannot elude the necessity, especially at the dawn of this new age which is going to be characterized as much by theological interest as its predecessor was by the lack of it, of relating Christianity and Christ to the ultimate nature of things. While heartily agreeing with the Dean of King's College, London (Dr. W. R. Matthews) that what is primary in Christianity is not the teaching of correct theology but the propagation of an experience, we affirm and maintain that the missionary movement must become more theological, not primarily for those to whom missionaries go, but for the Church herself and the missionaries who represent her. The strength and success of these will depend to a very great extent on their clear apprehension of the relation between the Jesus of history and His teachings and the Living God. 'A theology,' says R. S. Franks, in his essay on 'The Present Relation between Philosophy and Theology,' [1] 'is absolutely necessary to every religion that seeks to maintain itself in the world. It forms the silent coefficient of all preaching and teaching.'

[1] In the volume, *The Future of Christianity* (Harpers).

The modern mind wants to know if God is like Jesus. That sets the inescapable theological problems. What shall our answer be? Jesus Christ is the incarnate revelation of God. In Him the transcendent God, the 'entirely other,' revealed Himself in human flesh. 'The empirical, historical personality of Jesus is the adequate incarnation in time and space of the Eternal Word.'[1] In the fact of the incarnation we find that objectivity in religion which our whole personality craves.[2] The personality of Jesus is no mere transient phosphorescence upon the ocean route of history, but the Eternal Light. What we call His Cross is not simply a symbol of an eternal truth regarding God: it is also an event in a divine drama of love, where the Eternal and the temporal, the Divine and the human met in the sphere of history for man's redemption. God was in the Crucified, 'reconciling the world unto Himself.' Our redemption was costly to Him, and the Cross is the proof of it. We are accustomed to speak of the love of Christ; let us not forget the love of God. In his most recent book, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*, Professor H. R. Mackintosh tells us of a great evangelist who in his first days 'spoke most about the sacrifice of Christ, but when he got older he came to speak as much of the sacrifice of the Father.' If we view the Cross as anything short of a supreme redemptive act in which the initiative belonged to God, we fail to obtain that view of the Eternal which is consonant with infinite love. It is only an objective atonement, moreover,

[1] Matthews, W. R. 'The Doctrine of Christ,' in *The Future of Christianity*.

[2] Cf. 'Objectivity in Religion,' by John Macmurray, in *Adventure*, edited by Canon Streeter.

that can satisfy a man's conscience once he becomes exercised about the tremendous thing sin is.

But we now 'know Christ no more after the flesh.' We must know Him as the Risen One. It is most interesting to see how attention is returning again to Paul and his communion with the living Christ. He must live in us and we live in Him.

May we be allowed to express the conviction that the next great advance in the missionary enterprise will come when the Church has attained a sense of the cosmic significance of Jesus and a fresh experience of a Divine Lord? When we have explored the depths of what Paul meant by the phrase 'in Christ,' when our imaginations have been fired by his triumphant setting of Christ in the eternal scheme of things, then shall the Church face the world 'as an army with banners.' The lost radiance will come back to us, and men will 'catch from our joyance the surprise of joy.'

III. HOW PRESENT THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE?

There remains the third question: By what means can attention to the Christian message be most effectively secured? For it is obvious that the progress of Christianity will be in direct relation to the degree in which Christian missionaries succeed in getting a hearing for their Gospel.

There are different ways, of course, in which Jesus can be presented to the world's attention. He can be incarnated, for example, in institutions and forms of activity the immediate end of which may be general human welfare. Mission schools and hospitals that do not directly exist for evangelistic purposes

are sometimes regarded by the supporting missions as purely secular institutions, and financial aid is frequently withdrawn from them. Such an opinion is utterly wrong. These institutions have both a religious and an evangelistic value. They have a religious value as a necessary expression of the spirit of Christ, without which no church or society interested in the propagation of Christianity can ever attain full Christian stature, without which also non-Christians would be denied some of the most convincing witnesses to the power and disinterestedness of the Christian religion. They have at the same time a very decided evangelistic value, in that they constitute those 'good works' which sooner or later will lead men to 'glorify the Father who is in Heaven.' Very frequently it becomes the privilege of teachers, doctors and nurses to do evangelistic work of the very highest kind. And sad indeed would it be if, when they were confronted in the course of their professional work with sincere requests for religious enlightenment, they had no message or experience to offer.

Here, however, we are more specifically concerned with the problems of the so-called missionary 'evangelist,' the man whose task is to make vocal the Christian message by his lips or his pen. It must be frankly admitted that the problem of the evangelistic missionary is becoming increasingly difficult and complicated. In some countries, as in Mexico, no foreigner of any religion is allowed to lead a religious service or to 'preach,' in the technical sense of the word. In many countries there is suspicion of the professional religious propagandist. People will not listen to him or take him on his merits. In others a spirit of nationalism and a chauvinistic pride in all

those values, including religious values, which have been closely associated with the nation's life in the past, produce hostility towards exotic religious ideas. In others still the evangelistic missionary finds it difficult to get a serious hearing because he is regarded as simply the advance guard of some nation looking for special privileges, which sends missionary heralds to prepare the way of the 'lord.' To these may be added this other difficulty. The progress of education in so-called mission lands makes nationals increasingly critical of the missionary's linguistic attainments. The only foreigner who has now much chance of being a successful evangelist is one who is able to present the Christian message in at least as acceptable speech as the average educated national.

In view of all these difficulties how shall a hearing be got for the Christian message? How shall the evangelist be able to fulfil his apostolic task? We venture to suggest three principles which we believe hold good for pioneer evangelism everywhere, at home or abroad.

Win a Right to be Heard

The first is: Win a right to be heard. The evangelist must show himself to be a man. He must represent some human value that the group he proposes to evangelize can appreciate, or he will not be seriously listened to. The kind of human value required will depend upon the character of the group. To ensure a hearing from the lumber-jacks of the Oregon woods will require qualities very different from those necessary to secure an attentive audience of university students in Japan. In the old days in Northern Scotland, a famous Highland minister began his

incumbency in a parish noted for its godlessness by wrestling on a Sunday morning with ' Big Rory,' the champion wrestler of that region. The new minister laid Rory on his broad back, and from that day on he had an attentive audience on Sundays, where formerly no one went to church.

The more closely and unselfishly the evangelist identifies himself with his community, the more appreciation he shows of national thought, customs and aspirations; in a word, the more he strips himself of his foreignness, the less difficulty will he have in introducing his Lord to the attention of the people.

There is no natural talent or attainment which he cannot or should not turn to account to gain an entrance for his message. He may have a great capacity for friendship and Christlike sympathy. That will soon provide him with a receptive audience. He may be an authority on some subject of community interest. Let him tell what is in him: to-morrow the same people will listen to him when he speaks about his faith. An interesting case in point occurred lately in Uruguay. This progressive little Republic has the reputation of being one of the most fanatically radical and secularistic in the world. Some years ago it set about eliminating all religious associations from the calendar, changing ' Holy Week ' into ' Touring Week ' and ' Christmas Day ' into ' Family Day.' In no town in South America is it more difficult to get an audience for a religious message than in Montevideo, the Uruguayan capital. Yet a young Spanish priest succeeded, a year ago, in getting the ear of the Uruguayan public for a course of evangelistic addresses, drawing immense crowds every evening for a week. How did he do it ? He was a student of science as well as of theology. He had

been a pupil of the world famous histologist, Ramón y Cajal; and so he made his début before the public of Montevideo by giving a course of lectures on science in the National University.

Present that Aspect of Christ which the Situation requires

The second principle is: Present that aspect of Christ or of truth which the situation requires. The evangelistic message must be organic to need. The evangelist must find his point of departure in the immediate outlook and circumstances of the people he addresses. He must not start by giving a rounded-off epitome of truth. He will not get very far with a discourse on the nature of God if the very name of God is repugnant to his hearers. He will be casting pearls before swine by discoursing on the unsearchable riches of Christ if his audience has never thought of Christ save as a fetish or as an object of pity, or as a beautiful Hellenic figure who uttered romantic ideas about God, but who has no message for, or influence upon, the daily life of men.

Such a situation exists in many parts of Latin America. A young apostle of social reform once said to the writer that the name of God nauseated in his mouth every time he tried to utter it, because from his boyhood up God had been associated in his mind with social crimes and injustices which he abhorred. The thing to be done in such a case was to draw attention to the denunciations launched against the injustices of their time by the prophets of the Old Testament, and to the prophetic masculinity of Jesus when He cleared the temple courts of godless traffickers, and indicted the official religion of His

time as an unholy alliance with Mammon. Soon the literature of the 'reformers' began to publish passages from the Old Testament and Gospels. The Christ of the whip began to make His way on the South American road. The writer found His portrait, later, on the work-table of a young blue-blooded Peruvian, who had been deported from his country for his love of the people. The young man pointed to the picture and said: 'The Comrade Christ!' When Jesus Christ is so presented as to meet an actual interest or need in a man's life He will thereafter make His own way.

'O happy band of pilgrims,
If onward ye will tread
With Jesus as your Fellow,
To Jesus as your head.'

When necessary, rid the Presentation of Ritual Accompaniments

Thirdly and lastly, in dealing with men outside the Church, or who are indifferent or hostile to organized religion: Rid the presentation of the Christian message of all ritual accompaniments. Why should the evangelist insist on giving his message only as part of a 'service,' if he wants to reach people who believe that religion is no more than ceremonial, which thing does not interest them, or who consider that their presence in a meeting during singing, scripture reading and prayer, would make them hypocrites because for them it would be tantamount to expressing acceptance of the religion of those directing the service. Let us face the plain truth and not sin against Christ and men. There are multitudes of people, the world over, who will never be brought within reach of the Christian message so long as

Christ's messengers insist that they cannot preach Him except as part of a religious service. Our Lord Himself did not hold a service on the hills of Galilee each time He preached the Kingdom; no, He simply 'opened His mouth and taught.' When men's hearts become touched and new spiritual needs make themselves felt, a worship service will have new meaning for them, and they will be glad when the suggestion is made, 'Let us go up into the House of the Lord.'

It is the Spirit that quickens. It is only God who can give the increase to the seed which Paul sows and Apollos waters. Very true. But it is the bounden duty of all Gospel heralds to leave nothing undone which sanctified common sense can do to secure a fair hearing for the Divine Saviour and Lord on the part of the people to whom they minister and among whom their lot is cast.

A STATEMENT OF THE CASE FOR EVANGELIZATION

THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER
(ARCHBISHOP-DESIGNATE OF YORK)

I

THE comparative study of religion has commonly been pursued by those who had little or no personal conviction of the uniqueness of the Christian revelation. Consequently it has tended to start with the assumption that all religions stand, more or less, on a level; they are treated as variants of one general tendency of the human mind; if there is any divine impulse behind them it is sought chiefly in that general tendency rather than in the distinctive features of any particular religion; and so far as it is allowed that one religion has more divine authority than another, this is understood to mean that it corresponds better with the real nature of the impulse that finds expression in all religions.

But to begin thus is to begin with the unproved denial of the claim which Christianity makes. It is not to be wondered at that, having made this great negative assumption, the comparative study of religion goes on to trace parallels and resemblances in every direction; nor that, having traced these, it should create in the popular mind a belief that the inner essence of all religions is identical while they differ in their vehicles of expression. But this resultant belief in the popular mind is certainly

false. The fact is that religions differ comparatively little in their vehicles or media of expression; they differ widely and deeply in their essence. For the essence of a religion is the character of the God to whom worship is offered.

Ours is the age of psychology. Whenever a new science begins to establish its position it casts a glamour upon the human mind. Mathematics is the most fundamental of sciences and was the first to establish itself. Forthwith there arose a school of philosophy—the Pythagorean—which professed to find in number the explanation of all things. We leap over the generations and find the triumphs of physics and chemistry in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries giving rise to a philosophy—materialistic determinism or naturalism—which repeated for those sciences the attempt made by Pythagoras on behalf of number. Argumentatively, naturalism (as far as English writings are concerned), was annihilated by James Ward in his brilliant Gifford Lectures on *Naturalism and Agnosticism*. But a popular belief has great power of surviving its own dialectical destruction; and naturalism is now dying out, not through defeat (though it has been defeated), but through its displacement by an outlook based on the newly prominent science of psychology.

This science, following the best precedents, also aspires to a universal domination. All beliefs and experiences are subjected to its scrutiny. So far, that is quite right. It was possible to claim for number the power to explain all things only because all things that exist are capable of being counted; so that, as Edward Caird used to say, 'The science of quantity does tell us something about everything;

but then it tells us very little about anything.' In just the same way, psychology can tell us a good deal about all our experiences, opinions and convictions; it can tell us how they tend to arise and to group themselves together; and because it can tell us something about all experiences and beliefs, people often take it for granted that it is itself the ultimate science. But there is one thing—quite an important thing—that psychology can never tell us about our beliefs; it can never tell us whether they are true. As soon as that question is raised, psychology is powerless. The psychologist may trace the process by which I come to hold a belief, but unless it allows some other test of the truth of my belief than this, I can retort by tracing for the psychologist the source of his belief about the source of my belief. Even if it were the true psychological account of men's religious faith that they invented the idea of God as a refuge from the miseries or injustices of life, there would still be the question whether God actually exists.

Now the comparative study of religion has been conducted on anthropological and psychological lines. To pursue it upon those lines has been perfectly legitimate, so long as the limitations involved are recognized. All religions have aspects for which such study is appropriate. But no religion, in the estimate of its own adherents, is exhausted by those aspects. Every religion claims to be, not only a state of mind in those who practise it, but an apprehension of a truth which is independent of their minds altogether; and its whole significance for them resides in this. Consequently the process by which the comparative study of religions has appeared to put all religions on a level is one which first

eviscerates all religions of all that causes any one to care about them. In other words, if what this sort of comparative study can tell us were the whole truth, there would be no religions at all to be studied or compared.

The essential element in any religion is its claim to be true, whether partially and relatively, or completely and absolutely; to put it another way, the essential element in any religion is not to be found in a human attitude towards something, but in the something towards which that human attitude is taken up. The essential element in any religion is the character of its God. And it is here that religions deeply differ from one another.

The tendencies of the comparative study of religion have had a natural reaction on many Christian people, who, being convinced of the uniqueness of the revelation entrusted to them, shrank from all contact with a method of study which seemed to rest on the denial of that uniqueness. Consequently there was not a little anxiety when it became known that the International Missionary Council was to be asked to discuss 'The Christian Life and Message in relation to Non-Christian Systems,' and that to facilitate such discussions a series of papers had been prepared, setting forth the distinctive 'values' of those systems. In some quarters there was a fear that the Council would turn out to be committed, by merely embarking on this enquiry, to some sort of vicious syncretism or to the denial by implication of the uniqueness of the Gospel. Nor can it be denied that there was inevitable risk in the method adopted. But here, as so often, the avoidance of risk merely means the deliberate choice and acceptance of one particular disaster. For how are we

to proceed from the assertion of the uniqueness of Christ to its demonstration, unless there is instituted a comparison between the Gospel and other religions at their best? Moreover, uniqueness is not the only attribute of the Gospel; universality is another. And how are we to present Christ as the fulfilment, and more than the fulfilment, of the highest aspirations of the many races of mankind, unless we know sympathetically what those highest aspirations are? The message actually adopted by the Council is the true justification of the method which it followed.

II

'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people.' It would not be fantastic to say that the first verse of Zachariah's hymn contains the whole distinctive element of the Gospel. At any rate it fastens attention upon the belief in a God who is active in the world, and has taken action for the salvation of men. The fundamental presuppositions of Christianity have so far permeated western thought that we are liable to regard them rather as springing from the western temperament than from the Christian revelation. So it is with the belief in God as Righteous Will, whom we must serve, not by ceremonial observance or even by contemplation and mystic absorption, but by the submission of our wills to His—and this, not because He is Omnipotent and can destroy those who resist Him, but because He is Holy and His Righteousness commands the assent of our consciences. We contrast the western insistence on the Will with the eastern contemplation of a static

Being. But that insistence upon the primacy of Will is not native to the West; the West learnt it from Israel; it came into human thought and belief through Moses and the Prophets.

When we enquire into the religious state of Europe before its conversion to Christianity we find a condition of affairs very like what is met with in the non-Christian regions of the earth to-day. The religious phenomena of the Græco-Roman world are very like those of contemporary India. There was a welter of cults and deities, some edifying, some degrading, most (perhaps) capable, like the worship of Dionysius, of being turned either way by the interpretation of individual worshippers. There were sublime philosophies for those who could appreciate them, and these were often presented as a sort of interpretation of the current religious beliefs. There was a strongly defined social ethic, but its relation to religion, whether popular or philosophic, was hazy. Plato here, as so often, bursts the mould of Greek thought and reaches out towards a living and righteous God; but the more consistently Hellenic Aristotle does not allow God even to know of our existence; for His perfect knowledge cannot condescend to ' particulars '; He lives in the thinking of thought. And the highest life for man is not co-operation with God in the fulfilment of His purpose, but contemplation of Him and participation to the utmost in His intellectual beatitude, for which a complete self-control in relation to all passions is an indispensable condition. Plainly there are here clear affinities with (for example) Hinduism and Buddhism. High-sounding aphorisms flowed readily enough from the lips of those who had this background to their lives; but there was no general expectation of corresponding conduct. We

often hear quoted as evidence of a noble ethical standard in pre-Christian Rome the line

'Homo sum: nihil humanum a me alienum puto,'

but it is deeply significant that into the mouth of the man who makes this high profession Terence also puts an injunction to his wife that if the child she is expecting proves to be a daughter it is to be 'exposed,' that is, left to die.

The belief in the supremacy of righteousness both in the universe, because God is righteous, and in humanity, because God has made man in His own image, is not native to the West; it came to the West from Israel. And it was not native to Israel; it came to Israel through the prophets.

Here is the first point on which we must lay our stress—the unique revelation alike of God and of man which is given through the Bible. The true division is not between West and East, but between Bible and no-Bible. It is possible that there is in Zoroaster that same apprehension which, broadly speaking, is characteristic of the Bible only. If so, it should not surprise us; the fact that rays of the true light shine everywhere is no contradiction of the other fact that in the Bible they are focused as in a burning-glass. Islam is either a development (as it claims) or a perversion (as we think) of the strain that once found its home in Israel, and therefore has inherited much of the Biblical outlook. But it has gone back from the proclamation of a righteous God who is almighty to the conception of an almighty God whose commands determine what is righteous; and so far it inclines away from the true prophetic faith towards the common tendencies of human religion.

'Salvation is from the Jews.' That is the first contention in the case for evangelism as I see it. No doubt this makes the reception of the Gospel hard for many races; hard, for example, for India, with its consciousness of special spirituality; hard for Europe, with its tendency to appropriate as its own whatever it finds precious; hard for Israel, because of the necessary implication of a confession of a national apostasy in the past.

III

But the Bible, as the sacred book of Christians, is always to be interpreted in reference to Jesus Christ. It is He who, by fulfilling its earlier aspirations, confers upon it a unique quality. Elsewhere in the Bible the word of God is heard in 'divers portions and in divers manners'—but He is Himself the very Word of God. The light shines elsewhere also, and not only in Scripture; indeed it 'lighteth every man,' but in Jesus Christ it shone forth in its full splendour. Therefore we must remember that, as He is the crown, so He is also the criterion of all revelation. Whatsoever in other revelation is incompatible with what we find in Him must be attributed to the human medium through which the revelation comes. For God did not at the time of the Incarnation first become what He is there revealed to be; the Incarnation is the self-disclosure, at a moment of time, of what God eternally is.

Thus our reading of the Bible other than the Gospels will be deeply reverent, but also critical. Yet the standard of our criticism will not be our own preferences or even our own convictions, except so

far as these are founded on Jesus Christ. He cannot be fully understood apart from the preparation for His coming in the history and religious experience of Israel; therefore the Old Testament is an indispensable part of our Message. But, if the Gospel be true, the Old Testament cannot be properly understood at all except as it is fulfilled in Him; therefore, though the whole Bible is our sacred Book, it is yet true and vitally important that the Message of Christianity is the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

But as we must bear in mind that the Bible which is fundamental for Christianity is the Bible as focused in and interpreted by Christ, so too we must remember that Christ is Himself the heart of the Gospel, not as a merely historic Figure who once lived on earth, but as the one historic Figure in whom the Eternal God is once for all revealed. What matters in any religion is always its doctrine of God. We may meet with people who, looking on from outside, wonder at the sharp division which Christianity maintains between itself and Islam. 'After all,' they say, 'both are forms of faith in the One God; you say that Jesus is His spokesman; Moslems agree, but say that Mohammed also is His spokesman. Is the difference so very great?' We must answer, 'Yes, it is the greatest possible; for the character of Allah in Islam is totally different from the character of the Father in Christianity. We claim that Jesus Christ is more than one among many divinely inspired teachers; we claim that He is actually God. And we make this claim for Him, not chiefly in order to honour the historic Jesus; He sought no such honour. We make this claim for Him, because what is of vital consequence is the character of God. It is not because He had a new conception of God that

men have found in Jesus Christ the Saviour of themselves and of the world ; it is because they have found Him to be Himself the Eternal God.'

This claim can only be finally established by a complete philosophy and the experience of mankind. But it glows as a conviction of faith at the very heart of Christianity. We do not expect to see it logically proved ; what we have a right to expect is that when applied to actual problems, practical or theoretical, it should guide us towards a solution ; and this is what we actually find. Yet it is not the strength of its intellectual position by which it wins victories over individuals or races ; it is its manifest power to re-create alike the soul and society. 'As many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God.' That is not the utterance of an aspiration, it is the record of an observed fact, and it is the observation of that fact that has drawn, and still draws men to Christ as the source of the new vitalizing power.

IV

Christians are naturally and rightly eager to divert attention from the evidence of their own lives to the essence of the Gospel itself. We know ourselves to be unworthy representatives of Christ, we know our civilization to be most meagre as a measure of what God in Christ can do for men in answer to their faith. So we ask them to look, not at us, but at Him ; and we do well. And yet, they too are right when they turn back to us enquiring for the proof that the Gospel is indeed possessed with power. Its beauty they see in itself ; its power they must see in our lives if they are to see it at all.

To the Christian there should be no need to argue the case for evangelization; yet it seems that it is necessary; for Christians often fail to apprehend the nature of their own religion. They think of it as one among the religions of mankind, and look out for its distinctive characteristics, and contentedly classify themselves as Christians, and others as Moslems, or Hindus, or whatever it may be, as though they were speaking of so many political parties. They think of Christianity as the appropriate religion for Europeans or Americans, while Islam is the appropriate religion for Arabs and Hinduism for Indians. But Christianity is not just one phase of human opinion. Its whole significance depends upon its claim to be absolute and final. If that quality is denied to it, it sinks at once to the level of any human speculation or aspiration, and ceases to be the faith for which the martyrs have died.

There is nothing in this claim hostile to that belief in perpetual development which is so dear to the mind of the present generation. That for which finality is claimed is not a system of thought or a code of ethics; it is a personal life. In the understanding of that life and in the application of its spirit and principles to every kind of problem there is room for strictly endless development. But if Christ was and is what Christians believe Him to be, it certainly follows that there can be no future revelation by which He could possibly be superseded; in just the same way the multiplication table cannot be superseded, but this is not regarded as a hindrance to the development of mathematical science.

But while this claim to finality leaves ample room for progress and development, it leaves none, as the multiplication table leaves none, for any notion that

it may be the right belief for some and not for others. The Gospel is not first and foremost a medicine to heal ourselves, adapted to some maladies and not to others. It is first and foremost Truth, and is efficacious as medicine for men's souls only in proportion as it is accepted as Truth. And if it is Truth, then very plainly it is the Truth which it is most important for men to know. It is because it is the Truth and in it Reality is expressed that to conform to it is to build one's house upon the rock.

If all this is accepted, the case for evangelization needs no further advocacy. Least of all can Christians, who know this Truth, suppose that they can escape the obligation to impart it to others. But there are further grounds to be given, going nearer to the impulsive roots of human action.

It is in the very nature of Christianity that truly to possess it inevitably leads to passing it on. For in it God's greatest gift to us is the gift of Himself in the Holy Spirit ; but in it He reveals Himself as Love, such love as is shown in the Life and Death of Jesus Christ. But love is self-giving ; therefore to receive that gift and merely keep it to ourselves is impossible ; if we are not passing it on, that is proof that we have not received it. The very essence of the gift, as of God who gives it, is the energy of self-giving to the point of self-sacrifice. If we know what the word truly implies we must see that ' Christian ' and ' missionary ' are synonymous terms.

Yet, once more, we know that the love of Christ goes out to all men as to ourselves ; and, being love, it yearns for love in answer. If we have any understanding at all of the love of God in Christ, we must devote ourselves to the appeasement of the hunger in His heart for those to whom we have not yet

carried the knowledge of that love, that He may see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied.

No degree of appreciation of noble qualities in other religions can in the least degree diminish the sense of obligation in Christians to carry the Gospel through the world, if they have any true understanding of what the Gospel is.

V

As a matter of fact evidence comes in from every side to show that, for all their noble qualities, the other religions are falling before the onset of that secular view of life which modern civilization so easily induces. Christianity is called upon to face the same danger, and it may appear presumptuous to assume that Christianity can defeat it. But there are certain considerations which go far toward removing that appearance.

In the first place, Christianity finds itself at home with the new, but now universal, belief that progress is a normal concomitant of life. It is wholesome to realize how novel that belief really is. For many centuries the external conditions of life remained unaltered, and it was a common assumption that stability of institutions was a sign of social health. In England, where practical exigencies are always allowed to triumph over theoretical convictions, change went on in fact while constancy was applauded as a principle. In France, the river of change was held back until 1789, when it broke its banks and flooded all Europe. As late as 1832 Lord Grey commended the first English Reform Bill to the House of Commons by the plea that it would be a

final settlement of the franchise question. Of course it was nothing of the kind, and no politician would dream of advancing such a plea to-day. The change is profound: our grandfathers assumed constancy and tinkered with adjustments; we assume change and only try to direct it.

To most religions this atmosphere of constant change is very menacing, but need not be so to Christianity. For this is one of the distinctive characteristics of Christianity, that whereas all other religions have tended to stereotype the conditions in which they originated, because only in those conditions could their requirements be obeyed, Christianity has been a fermenting principle of change in every society into which it has come. This is primarily because it is centred not upon a formula but upon a Person, and its regulative principle is not a code but a Spirit. Moreover, it has stood committed to a doctrine of progress ever since our Lord Himself asserted the divine authority of the Mosaic Law and yet superseded it with another, and St Paul, following where his Master led, asserted again the divine authority of that Law and declared it abrogated. To attribute divine authority to something for one period and deny it for another is to presuppose change and progress as part of the divine purpose. We have already seen that this is in no way incompatible with certain forms of constancy; in fact the making of actual progress entirely depends on the constancy of direction. If the direction is always being changed, no progress can be made at all; constancy of direction for movement is the polar opposite of unchangeableness. This is the constancy that the Gospel gives us. Our starting-point is fixed; it is the creative love of God. Our goal is

fixed; it is the realized Kingdom of God. And our way is fixed; it is found in Him who said, 'I am the Way.'

In the second place, we may gain encouragement from recognition of the source of this great change in men's outlook. It comes directly from the constant change in actual conditions, but that comes itself from the advance of natural science. It is a plain fact of history that the great advance of natural science has taken place in Christendom and not outside it. It may be rash to argue, as some students of the subject have done, that science is itself a fruit of Christianity, but it may be safely asserted that it can never spontaneously grow up in regions where the ruling principle of the universe is believed to be either capricious or hostile, and when it is imported into those regions it is bound to undermine such a belief. There is a kinship between the scientific impulse and the essential elements in Christianity which explains how science could win its triumphs in Christendom, and at least inspires a hope that it will not destroy but strengthen Christian faith.

But the first impact of natural science upon a civilization is liable to result in materialism. The immensely increased control over nature makes men feel independent of any higher power, and the concentration on material goods and the processes of producing them and distributing them diverts attention from spiritual interests. Now this urgent materialism of a scientific civilization is too powerful to be merely repressed; it may be controlled or sublimated (as the current jargon has it), but not repressed. And it cannot be controlled by any religion which either is immersed in the material or turns its back upon it. What is the Hindu reformer

to do with steam and electricity? His religion says they are part of the illusion of life; it will not help him to control them. He may try to neglect them, as Mr Gandhi does, but they will be too strong for him. Or he may keep his religion in one compartment and his political or social action in another; and then the compartment allocated to religion will shrink while the other expands. What is wanted is a religion for which matter is the proper vehicle of spirit, and spirit is recognized to act by directing matter; and Christianity alone answers to that description. Its central affirmation is that 'the Word was made flesh.' It is the most materialistic of all higher religions, for while they attain to spirituality by turning away from matter, it expresses its spirituality by dominating matter. After all the only purely spiritual things in the world are good intentions; and we all know where that road leads which is paved by them. For Christianity matter exists to be the vehicle of spirit, and is only fulfilling its true function when it is that; but spirit realizes itself by controlling matter and only expresses itself so far as it does that. Taught by the Incarnation, the Christian finds all the universe a Sacrament, which finds its focal expression in the Word made flesh.

This carries with it the obligations not only of personal self-control but of subduing the whole material order of society to the Spirit of Christ. To make what is now the sphere of ruthless competition an expression of true fellowship is the great need of the whole civilized world. That aspiration so entirely coheres with the Christian Gospel as to be almost part of it. Here, too, the Gospel gives us the direction in which progress must be made.

Yet once more, the political discovery of the modern world is democracy, and the moral root of democracy is respect for individual personality. But the very notion of personality as we conceive it to-day is a product of Christianity. Democracy is a child of the Gospel. And it desperately needs the Gospel to keep it wholesome; for it is liable to two perversions. One of these is that chaotic licence, for which Plato denounces democracy. If the true principle that all personality is sacred is held without regard to the balancing principle that we are all members one of another, it leads to moral and social chaos; in Christianity these two principles are held in an even balance. But modern democracy is still more likely to suffer from the other perversion. Its inevitable machinery of majorities and mass-meetings tends to give a most unwholesome development to the herd-instinct; thus the majority becomes tyrannous, and individuality is crushed. The only sound reason for giving authority to a majority is that this is the only way to give full weight to the personal quality in every citizen; therefore the right of the majority to govern is inseparable from the right of the minority to hold its own convictions; and democracy is only true to itself when it has the most delicate sensitiveness of conscience about the rights of minorities. It is under perpetual temptation to trample on them; only if its spiritual roots—belief in human brotherhood under God's Fatherhood—are strong is there any hope of its resisting them. What we need is independence of thought and the spirit of fellowship; what modern urbanized civilization is creating is herd-mentality with a spirit of pugnacity. This perversion will only be cured by a power more compelling than the influence of social environment

—by a religion, therefore. But it must be a religion in which the root principle of democracy is strong.

May we not, then, sum up the case for evangelization in this way ?—Christians are bound by the very nature of their faith to propagate it : the whole world demonstrably needs what Christianity can alone, or in a unique degree, supply. God's gift answers man's need. That it should be so is evidence of the authenticity of the gift. But in answering it the gift does more than satisfy it. For below these temporal conditions, the relation of which to the Gospel we have been considering, there is the unchanging need of man for the Eternal God and for the redemption by which alone he can be brought into the divine fellowship. This unchanging need the Gospel ever satisfies. That it will always do so we have no doubt, though we can give no proof. ' We speak that we do know and bear witness of that we have seen.'

PART FOUR

STATEMENT

ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL MEETING AT JERUSALEM, 1928

STATEMENT BY THE COUNCIL

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE

Go and make Disciples of all Nations

THROUGHOUT the world there is a sense of insecurity and instability. Ancient religions are undergoing modification, and in some regions dissolution, as scientific and commercial development alter the current of men's thought. Institutions regarded with age-long veneration are discarded or called in question; well-established standards of moral conduct are brought under criticism; and countries called Christian feel the stress as truly as the peoples of Asia and Africa. On all sides doubt is expressed whether there is any absolute truth or goodness. A new relativism struggles to enthrone itself in human thought.

Along with this is found the existence of world-wide suffering and pain, which expresses itself partly in a despair of all higher values, partly in a tragically earnest quest of a new basis for life and thought, in the birthpangs of rising nationalism, in the ever keener consciousness of race and class oppression.

Amid widespread indifference and immersion in material concerns we also find everywhere, now in noble forms and now in licence or extravagance, a great yearning, especially among the youth of the world, for the full and untrammelled expression of

personality, for spiritual leadership and authority, for reality in religion, for social justice, for human brotherhood, for international peace.

In this world, bewildered and groping for its way, Jesus Christ has drawn to Himself the attention and admiration of mankind as never before. He stands before men as plainly greater than western civilization, greater than the Christianity that the world has come to know. Many who have not hitherto been won to His Church yet find in Him their hero and their ideal. Within His Church there is a widespread desire for unity centred in His Person.

Our Message

Against this background and in relation to it, we have to proclaim our message.

Our message is Jesus Christ. He is the revelation of what God is and of what man through Him may become. In Him we come face to face with the ultimate reality of the universe ; He makes known to us God as our Father, perfect and infinite in love and in righteousness ; for in Him we find God incarnate, the final, yet ever unfolding, revelation of the God in whom we live and move and have our being.

We hold that through all that happens, in light and in darkness, God is working, ruling and overruling. Jesus Christ, in His life and through His death and resurrection, has disclosed to us the Father, the Supreme Reality, as almighty Love, reconciling the world to Himself by the Cross, suffering with men in their struggle against sin and evil, bearing with them and for them the burden of sin, forgiving them as they, with forgiveness in their own hearts, turn to

Him in repentance and faith, and creating humanity anew for an ever-growing, ever-enlarging, everlasting life.

The vision of God in Christ brings and deepens the sense of sin and guilt. We are not worthy of His love; we have by our own fault opposed His holy will. Yet that same vision which brings the sense of guilt brings also the assurance of pardon, if only we yield ourselves in faith to the spirit of Christ so that His redeeming love may avail to reconcile us to God.

We reaffirm that God, as Jesus Christ has revealed Him, requires all His children, in all circumstances, at all times and in all human relationships, to live in love and righteousness for His glory. By the resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit God offers His own power to men that they may be fellow-workers with Him, and urges them on to a life of adventure and self-sacrifice in preparation for the coming of His Kingdom in its fulness.

We will not ourselves offer any further formulation of the Christian message, for we remember that as lately as in August 1927 the World Conference on Faith and Order met at Lausanne, and that a statement on this subject was issued from that Conference after it had been received with full acceptance. We are glad to make this our own.

'The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

'The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

'The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old

Testament; and in the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth.

'Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fulness of the living God and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

'Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord, is also the centre of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer and of praise.

'The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to

the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service and compassionate love. It offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary and the crown of life to the martyr.

' The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

' Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men, " Come unto me ! . . . He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." '

The Missionary Motive

If such is our message, the motive for its delivery should be plain. The Gospel is the answer to the world's greatest need. It is not our discovery or achievement ; it rests on what we recognize as an act of God. It is first and foremost Good News. It announces glorious Truth. Its very nature forbids us to say that it may be the right belief for some but not for others. Either it is true for all, or it is not true at all.

But questions concerning the missionary motive have been widely raised, and such a change in the habits of men's thoughts as the last generation has witnessed must call for a re-examination of these questions.

Accordingly we would lay bare the motives that impel us to the missionary enterprise. We recognize that the health of our movement and of our souls demands a self-criticism that is relentless and exacting.

In searching for the motives that impel us we find ourselves eliminating decisively and at once certain motives that may seem, in the minds of some, to have become mixed up with purer motives in the history of the movement. We repudiate any attempt on the part of trade or of governments, openly or covertly, to use the missionary cause for ulterior purposes. Our Gospel by its very nature and by its declaration of the sacredness of human personality stands against all exploitation of man by man, so that we cannot tolerate any desire, conscious or unconscious, to use this movement for purposes of fastening a bondage, economic, political, or social, on any people.

Going deeper, on our part we would repudiate any symptoms of a religious imperialism that would desire to impose beliefs and practices on others in order to manage their souls in their supposed interests. We obey a God who respects our wills and we desire to respect those of others.

Nor have we the desire to bind up our Gospel with fixed ecclesiastical forms which derive their meaning from the experience of the western Church. Rather the aim should be to place at the disposal of the younger churches of all lands our collective and historic experience. We believe that much of that

heritage has come out of reality and will be worth sharing. But we ardently desire that the younger churches should express the Gospel through their own genius and through forms suitable to their racial heritage. There must be no desire to lord it over the personal or collective faith of others.

Our true and compelling motive lies in the very nature of the God to whom we have given our hearts. Since He is love, His very nature is to share. Christ is the expression in time of the eternal self-giving of the Father. Coming into fellowship with Christ we find in ourselves an over-mastering impulse to share Him with others. We are constrained by the love of Christ and by obedience to His last command. He Himself said, ' I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly,' and our experience corroborates it. He has become life to us. We would share that life.

We are assured that Christ comes with an offer of life to men and to societies and to nations. We believe that in Him the shackles of moral evil and guilt are broken from human personality and that men are made free, and that such personal freedom lies at the basis of the freeing of society from cramping custom and blighting social practices and political bondage, so that in Christ men and societies and nations may stand up free and complete.

We find in Christ, and especially in His cross and resurrection, an inexhaustible source of power that makes us hope when there is no hope. We believe that through it men and societies and nations that have lost their moral nerve to live will be quickened into life.

We have a pattern in our minds as to what form that life should take. We believe in a Christ-like

world. We know nothing better, we can be content with nothing less. We do not go to the nations called non-Christian because they are the worst of the world and they alone are in need—we go because they are a part of the world and share with us in the same human need—the need of redemption from ourselves and from sin, the need to have life complete and abundant and to be remade after this pattern of Christ-likeness. We desire a world in which Christ will not be crucified but where His Spirit shall reign. We believe that men are made for Christ and cannot really live apart from Him. Our fathers were impressed with the horror that men should die without Christ—we share that horror; we are impressed also with the horror that men should live without Christ.

Herein lies the Christian motive; it is simple. We cannot live without Christ and we cannot bear to think of men living without Him. We cannot be content to live in a world that is un-Christ-like. We cannot be idle while the yearning of His Heart for His brethren is unsatisfied.

Since Christ is the motive, the end of Christian missions fits in with that motive. This end is nothing less than the production of Christ-like character in individuals and societies and nations through faith in and fellowship with Christ the living Saviour, and through corporate sharing of life in a divine society.

Christ is our motive and Christ is our end. We must give nothing less, and we can give nothing more.

The Spirit of our Endeavour

Our approach to our task must be made in humility and penitence and love. In humility, because it is

not our own message which we bring, but God's, and if in our delivery of it self-assertion finds any place we shall spoil that message and hinder its acceptance; in penitence, because our fathers and we ourselves have been so blind to many of the implications of our faith; in love, because our message is the Gospel of the Love of God, and only by love in our own hearts for those to whom we speak can we make known its power or its true nature.

Especially do we confess the sluggishness of the older churches to realize and discharge their responsibility to carry the Gospel to all the world; and all alike we confess our neglect to bring the ordering of men's lives into conformity with the spirit of Christ. The Church has not firmly and effectively set its face against race-hatred, race-envy, race-contempt, or against social envy and contempt and class-bitterness, or against racial, national and social pride, or against the lust for wealth and exploitation of the poor or weak. We believe that the Gospel 'proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from class and race hatred.' But we are forced to recognize that such a claim requires to be made good and that the record of Christendom hitherto is not sufficient to sustain it. Nor has it sufficiently sought out the good and noble elements in the non-Christian beliefs, that it might learn that deeper personal fellowship with adherents of those beliefs wherein they may be more powerfully drawn to the living Christ. We know that, even apart from conscious knowledge of Him, when men are true to the best light they have, they are able to effect some real deliverance from many of the evils that afflict the world; and this should prompt us the more to help them to find the fulness of light and power in Christ.

But while we record these failures we are also bound to record with thankfulness the achievements of the Christian Church in this field. The difference between the Europe known to St Paul and the Europe known to Dante, to Luther, to Wesley is plain for all to see. From every quarter of the globe comes testimony to the liberation effected by Christ for women. Since the vast changes made by the development of industrialism have come to be appreciated, every country has had its Christian social movements, and the Universal Conference on Life and Work, held at Stockholm in 1925, revealed how widespread and influential these have become. Truly our efforts have not been commensurate with the needs of the world or with the claim of Christ ; but in what has been accomplished and attempted we have already great encouragement for the days to come. In particular there is a growing sensitiveness of conscience with regard to war and the conditions that may lead up to it. For all these indications of the growing power of the spirit of Christ among Christians we thank God. And we call on all Christian people to be ready for pioneering thought and action in the name of Christ. Too often the Church has adopted new truth, or new goals for enterprise, only when the danger attached to them is over. There is a risk of rashness ; but there is also possible an excessive caution by which, because His Church hangs back, the glory of new truth or enterprise which rightly belongs to Christ is in men's thoughts denied to Him.

The Call to the World

Filled with conviction that Jesus Christ is indeed the Saviour of the world, and conscious of a desperate

need in ourselves and in all the world for what He only can supply, we call upon our fellow-Christians and all our fellow-men to turn again to Him for pardon and for power.

1. To all the Churches of Christ we call: that they stand firmly upon the rock of Christian conviction and whole-heartedly accept its missionary obligations; that they go forward in full loyalty to Christ to discover and to express, in the power and freedom of the Holy Spirit, the treasures in His unsearchable riches which it is the privilege and duty of each to win for the Universal Church; that they strive to deliver the name of Christ and of Christianity from complicity in any evil or injustice.

Those who proclaim Christ's message must give evidence for it in their own lives and in the social institutions which they uphold. It is by living Christ among men that we may most effectively lift Him up before them. The spirit that returns love for hate, and overcomes evil with good, must be evidently present in those who would be witnesses for Christ. They are also bound to exert all their influence to secure that the social, international and inter-racial relationships in the midst of which their work is done are subordinate to and expressive of His spirit. Especially must it be a serious obstacle to missionary effort if a non-Christian country feels that the relation of the so-called Christian countries to itself is morally unsound or is alien from the principles of Christ, and the Church must be ready for labour and sacrifice to remove whatever is justly so condemned.

The task before us is beyond our powers. It can only be accomplished by the Holy Spirit, whose power we receive in its completeness only in the fellowship of Christ's disciples. We call all followers of Christ

to take their full share as members of His Body, which is the Church ; no discontent with its organization or tradition or failings should be allowed to keep us outside its fold ; the isolated Christian is impoverished in his spiritual life and impotent in his activities ; our strength both inward and outward is in the living fellowship. But in these hurried and feverish days there is also more need than ever for the deepening of our spiritual life through periodical detachment from the world and its need in lonely communion with God. We desire also to call for a greater volume of intercessory prayer. The whole Church should be earnest and instant in prayer, each part for every other, and all together for the Church's unity and for the hallowing of God's Name throughout the world.

Further, we call on Christians in all lands who are trained in science, art or philosophy to devote their talents to the working out of that Christian view of life and the world which we sorely need to secure us against instability, bewilderment and extravagance.

Lastly, we urge that every possible step be taken to make real the fellowship of the Gospel. The churches of the West send missions and missions-of-help to the churches of Africa and Asia. We believe that the time is come when all would gain if the younger churches were invited to send missions-of-help to the churches of Europe and America, that they may minister of their treasure to the spiritual life of those to whom they come.

2. To non-Christians also we make our call. We rejoice to think that just because in Jesus Christ the light that lighteneth every man shone forth in its full splendour, we find rays of that same light where He is unknown or even is rejected. We welcome

every noble quality in non-Christian persons or systems as further proof that the Father, who sent His Son into the world, has nowhere left Himself without witness.

Thus, merely to give illustration, and making no attempt to estimate the spiritual value of other religions to their adherents, we recognize as part of the one Truth that sense of the Majesty of God and the consequent reverence in worship, which are conspicuous in Islam ; the deep sympathy for the world's sorrow and unselfish search for the way of escape, which are at the heart of Buddhism ; the desire for contact with ultimate reality conceived as spiritual, which is prominent in Hinduism ; the belief in a moral order of the universe and consequent insistence on moral conduct, which are inculcated by Confucianism ; the disinterested pursuit of truth and of human welfare which are often found in those who stand for secular civilization but do not accept Christ as their Lord and Saviour.

Especially we make our call to the Jewish people, whose Scriptures have become our own, and 'of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh,' that with open heart they turn to that Lord in whom is fulfilled the hope of their nation, its prophetic message and its zeal for holiness. And we call upon our fellow-Christians in all lands to show to Jews that loving-kindness that has too seldom been shown towards them.

We call on the followers of non-Christian religions to join with us in the study of Jesus Christ as He stands before us in the Scriptures, His place in the life of the world, and His power to satisfy the human heart ; to hold fast to faith in the unseen and eternal in face of the growing materialism of the world ; to

co-operate with us against all the evils of secularism; to respect freedom of conscience so that men may confess Christ without separation from home and friends; and to discern that all the good of which men have conceived is fulfilled and secured in Christ.

Christianity is not a western religion, nor is it yet effectively accepted by the western world as a whole. Christ belongs to the peoples of Africa and Asia as much as to the European or American. We call all men to equal fellowship in Him. But to come to Him is always self-surrender. We must not come in the pride of national heritage or religious tradition; he who would enter the Kingdom of God must become as a little child, though in that Kingdom are all the treasures of man's aspirations, consecrated and harmonized. Just because Christ is the self-disclosure of the One God, all human aspirations are towards Him, and yet of no human tradition is He merely the continuation. He is the desire of all nations; but He is always more, and other, than they had desired before they learnt of Him.

But we would insist that when the Gospel of the Love of God comes home with power to the human heart, it speaks to each man, not as Moslem or as Buddhist, or as an adherent of any system, but just as man. And while we rightly study other religions in order to approach men wisely, yet at the last we speak as men to men, inviting them to share with us the pardon and the life that we have found in Christ.

3. To all who inherit the benefits of secular civilization and contribute to its advancement we make our call. We claim for Christ the labours of scientists and artists. We recognize their service to His cause in dispersing the darkness of ignorance, superstition and vulgarity. We appreciate also the

noble elements that are found in nationalist movements and in patriotism, the loyalty, the self-devotion, the idealism, which love of country can inspire. But even these may lead to strife and bitterness and narrowness of outlook if they are not dedicated to Christ; in His universal Kingdom of Love all nations by right are provinces, and fulfil their own true destiny only in His service. When patriotism and science are not consecrated they are often debased into self-assertion, exploitation and the service of greed. Indeed, throughout all nations the great peril of our time arises from that immense development of man's power over the resources of nature which has been the great characteristic of our epoch. This power gives opportunity for wealth of interest, and, through facilities of communication, for freedom of intercourse such as has never been known. But it has outgrown our spiritual and moral control.

Amid the clashes of industrial strife the Gospel summons men to work together as brothers in providing for the human family the economic basis of the good life. In the presence of social antipathies and exclusiveness the Gospel insists that we are members of one family, and that our Father desires for each a full and equal opportunity to attain to His own complete development, and to make his special contribution to the richness of the family life. Confronted by international relations that constantly flout Christ's law of love, there is laid on all who bear His name the solemn obligation to labour unceasingly for a new world-order in which justice shall be secured for all peoples, and every occasion for war or threat of war be removed.

Such changes can be brought about only through

an unreserved acceptance of Christ's way of love, and by the courageous and sacrificial living that it demands. Still ringing in our ears is the call, 'Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds.'

Conclusion

In our conference together we have seen more clearly the fulness and sufficiency of the Gospel and our own need of the salvation of Christ. The enlarging thoughts of the generation find the Gospel and the Saviour ever richer and greater than men had known.

This deepened assurance of the adequacy and universality of the Gospel, however, is not enough. More effective ways must be found for its proclamation, not to systems of opinion only, but to human beings, to men and women for whom Christ died. The most thorough and convincing intellectual statement of Christianity is necessary, but such statements cannot suffice. The Gospel must be expressed also in simplicity and love, and offered to men's hearts and minds by word and deed and life, by righteousness and loving-kindness, by justice, sympathy and compassion, by ministry to human needs and the deep want of the world.

As together, Christians of all lands, we have surveyed the world and the needs of men, we are convinced of the urgent necessity for a great increase in the Christian forces in all countries, and for a still fuller measure of co-operation between the churches of all nations in more speedily laying the claim of Christ upon all the unoccupied areas of the world and of human life.

We are persuaded that we and all Christian people must seek a more heroic practice of the Gospel. It cannot be that our present complacency and moderation are a faithful expression of the mind of Christ, and of the meaning of His Cross and Resurrection in the midst of the wrong and want and sin of our modern world. As we contemplate the work with which Christ has charged His Church, we who are met here on the Mount of Olives, in sight of Calvary, would take up for ourselves and summon those from whom we come, and to whom we return, to take up with us the Cross of Christ, and all that for which it stands, and to go forth into the world to live in the fellowship of His sufferings and by the power of His resurrection, in hope and expectation of His glorious Kingdom.

INDEX

(*See also Table of Contents*)

Agnosticism—
Buddhist, 210 f., 214; Confucian, 106 ff.; Moslem, 254 ff.
Ahimsa, 9, 12.
Amitabha(Buddhism), 146, 149 f., 212.
Ancestor worship—
communion of saints, 391; Confucianism, 71 ff., 109, 359, 389 f.; Hsun Tzu on, 72; idea of, 72, 111, 370; Mencius on, 71 f.
Anesaki, M. (*quoted*), 136, 153.
Animism—
Hindu, 3 f.; West African, 4, 364 f.
Aquinas, St Thomas, 304.
Aristotelianism and Christianity, 304, 357, 464.
Asia and the Fourth Gospel, 161 *et seq.*
Atheism—
Buddhism, 209; Chinese, 71; Japanese, 151; Moslem, 346, 402; 'rationalizers,' 292 f.; Swedish, 408 f.
Augustine, St, and Platonism, 303 f.

Barua, B. (*quoted*), 131.
Beauty, a value, 299 f.
Bevan, E.—
early Christian syncretism, 438 f.; racial pride, 436 f.
Bhagavad Gita, 29, 161, 383.
Bodhisattvas, 149 f., 163 f., 172 f., 211 ff., 432 f.
Buddha, Gautama, *see* Sakyamuni.
Buddhism—
as a whole, 119–234, 394–8 *passim*.
Buddhism (*continued*)—
Burma, 160, 177–85; Ceylon, 121–4, 126, 140–4; China, 145–50, 215 ff.; Japan, 146, 150–7, 160 f., 166–9, 187, 215 *et seq.*
aims of modern, 148; causation, 129; compromise, 205 f.; *dharma*, 123, 160, 170 f., 175; 'eight-fold path,' 133 f.; ethical doctrines, 199 ff.; and evil, 191 f.; 'four noble truths,' 133, 173, 191; *karma*, 165, 171, 193 f.; *Hinayana*, 120–66 *passim*; human nature, 192–8, 215 ff.; *Mahayana*, 120–218 *passim*, 432 f.; and literature, 145; magic, 146; missionary activity, 148, 396; modern revival of, 145–8; monasticism, 142, 154, 206; motive power, 123 f.; and moral law, 395; mysticism, 124–8, 130 f., 132 ff., 152, 188 ff.; *nirvana*, 118–201 *passim*; pantheism, 151 f., 154; patriotism (Japanese), 221, 233; personality, 193 ff., 201, 223 f., 397; philosophy, 124, 151–4, 210; piety, 121 f.; re-birth, 134, 141, 149, 194, 432; rationalism, 129 f., 183 f., 229 f.; salvation, 123, 131, 142, 149, 176, 197 ff.; *Samsara*, 126, 131; social service, 146, 152, 155, 228 f.; syncretism in, 153, 155 f., 216, 229; *tanha*, 127 ff.; the Trinity in, 175; view of God, 124, 151, 170, 208–11, 350, 395; and western Christianity, 138,

144, 148, 151, 153 ff., 167, 175 ff., 204, 228, 232 ff.; world brotherhood, 147; *yoga*, 132 ff.
See also Sakyamuni, *Bodhisattvas*.
Buddhist sects—
Daijo, 151; *Ittoen*, 151 f., 154 ff.; *Nichiren*, 152 ff., 168; *Pureland*, 146, 149, 165, 177; *Shin*, 155, 168; *Shingon*, 152, 156; *Shinsu*, 151 f., 153; *Shinto*, 216, 224, 422 ff.; *Zen*, 123, 151, 168, 223.
Burma, Buddhism in, 160, 177–85.
Bushido, 96.

Caste, Hindu, 20 f.
Ceylon, Buddhism in, 140–4.
China and Chinese—
agnosticism, 106 ff.; atheism, 71; Buddhism, 145–50; character, 66 f., 92; devotion to Confucius, 59 f., 71 ff.; ethical interests, 67 f.; fatalism, 389; filial piety, 74 ff., 111; philosophy, Christianity's service to, 109; religious needs of, 113 f., 117, 393 f.; Russell, B., on, 11–3, 54 ff.; science and modern, 106 ff., 147, 286 f., 296, 344 f., 346, 403.
See also Confucius, Confucianism.
Christian Church—
call to, 489 ff.; function of, 313; industrial problems, 407 ff., 413; need of aggression, 405 f.; new conception of, 335 f.; population: Great Britain, 285, Russia, 286 f., United States, 284 f.
Christianity—
absolute, 469; æsthetics, a rival to, 300 f.; aggressive, 204; atonement, 270 f., 352, 451 f.; brotherhood, 275 ff., 282 f.; change, 472 f.; commercialism, 317 f.; composite elements, 488 f.; and Deism, 32, 285 f.; divisions, 276 f.; drift from, 288–97; effects, 290 f., 323 f., 331, 408; evangelism, 452–8; evangelization, case for, 459–76; ethical stringency, 310 f., 422, 432, 447; and humanism, 289; human progress, 319 f.; immortality, 177, 322; medical service, 412; Message, 331, 343, 352, 380, 479–95 *passim*; how to present, 452–8, 479 *et seq.*; materialism, 378, 474; monistic pantheism, 28; naturalism, 313 ff., 369; obstacles to, China, 73 f., 112 ff., 390; Europe, 404 f.; India, 362 f., 383; Japan, 227 f., 230 ff.; the Orient, 204; pragmatic appeal of, 113 ff.; pressing spiritual problems of, 306 *et seq.*, 311 ff., 321, 328 ff., 405, 414, 434; re-interpreted by Clement of Alexandria, 303; St Augustine, 303; Thomas Aquinas, 304; present need, 303 ff.; revivalism, 324; saving power of, 306, 447–50; secularism, 284–338, 374 f.; science, 291 f., 294–7, 305, 308; test of, 298; and truth, 310, 355, 379, 412, 427, 470; uniqueness and universality, 356 f., 418, 422 f., 430–6, 492; values, 260–80; weaknesses of organized, 322 f., 374, 401, 405 f., 413, 487.
in relation to other religions, *see* Confucianism, etc. *See also* God, Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ, Mysticism.
Confucian concepts—
Ch'eng, 92 f.; *Chung*, 93; *Chuntzu*, 95; *Jen*, 70, 93 ff.; *Li*, 91 f.; *Shang Ti*, 69, 75 f., 86, 102 *et seq.*; *Shen Ling*, 107; *Shu*, 70, 94; *Tao*, 69–88 ff., 163, 215; *Ta T'ung*, 70, 100 ff., 116, 360; *T'ien*, 69, 86, 102 *et seq.*

Confucianism—
as a whole, 53–118, 358–60, 386–94 *passim*.
agnosticism, 86 f., 106 ff.; ancestor worship, 71 ff., 109 ff., 359, 390 f.; an ethical system, 63, 84, 99, 116; Christianity's contribution to, 115 f., 358 ff., 389; contacts with Christianity, 74–82, 111 f.; contribution to Christianity, 115 ff.; democracy, 67, 78; the family, 99 f., 111; fatalism, 87, 389; filial piety, 75 f.; 'the Five Relations,' 63, 97 f.; the Golden Rule, *see Jen*; materialism, 77; morality, 99, 358; pantheism, 358; rationalism, 61, 74, 77 f.; as religion, 68 ff., 81 ff., 87 f., 387; secularism, 359, 394; sin, 73, 394; view of God, *see* God (Confucian); values, 83–118; virtue, 98, 370 f., 391 f.; womanhood, 65, 70 f., 100 ff., 370 f.; world brotherhood, *see Ta T'ung*; and Young China, 65, 67, 394.
Confucius—
and education, 60, 62, 392; influence on China, 62–8, 86; mission of, 60 f., 84; pragmatist, 60, 84; principles of, 58 f., 62 f.; prophet, 354; and spirits, 61, 84, 87, 389; and womanhood, 370 ff., 391; worshipped, 72 f., 107.
Cross—
and Buddhism, 155 ff., 163 f.; doctrine of, 16, 27, 29 f., 82, 269 ff., 348, 359, 397, 431, 451, 485, 495.

Das, B. G. (*quoted*), 9, 39 f.
Deissmann, A. (*quoted*), 368, 449.
Democracy—
Christian origin, 475; and Confucianism, 67–78; and personality, 475; perversions, 475.
Evangelism—
case for, 459–76; methods of, 452–8.
Evil, Christianity and, 359; Buddhist view of, 191, 432.

Family—
Confucian, 99 f., 111; Moslem, 277 ff.
Farquhar, J. N., on Buddhism, 136 f.; Hinduism, 5 f.
Fatalism—
Buddhist, 165, 171, 193; Confucian, 87, 389; Hindu, *see karma*; Moslem, 260 f.
Forgiveness, 451 f., 480–3.
Fourth Gospel, Asia's need of, 161–6.
See Mysticism, Johannine.

Gandhi, M. K., 10, 12, 29, 35, 356, 443, 474.
Gautama, *see* Sakyamuni.
Germany, re-action against materialism, 403 f., 408.
God—
Buddhist views of: as *dharma*, 160, 170 f., 175; early, 151, 196, 203, 208–11, 350, 395; in *Mahayana*, 120, 129, 208 *et seq.*; modern (Japan), 149, 151, 175 f.
Christian: attributes, 348, 359, 433 f.; creator, 348, 352; fatherhood, 2, 5, 74, 76, 164, 234; holiness, 29, 32, 261, 348, 425; immanence, 27 f., 32, 78, 428; love, 81, 261, 379, 397, 480, 485; personality, 202 f., 210, 396, 422; redeeming activity, 353 f., 359, 397, 419, 448; revelation of, 118, 210, 356, 359, 424 f., 450 ff., 469; as righteous will, 395, 397, 463 f.; transcendence, 27 f., 32; ultimate reality, 427.
See also Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ, Trinity, the Holy.
Confucian: attributes, 103 ff.; impersonal moral principle, 76, 86 f., 102 f., 112, 117,

358, 393 ; personal, 105, 117 ; *summum bonum*, 97 f.
See also Confucianism.
Hindu : *advaita*, 24, 41 ff., 50, 165 ; *Brahman*, 31 ff., 37, 432 ; doctrine of (Vedanta), 26, 37 f., 42 f., 428 ; immanence, 22, 31 f. ; impersonal pantheism, 22 ff. ; peasants' idea, 47 f.
Moslem : attributes, 237 ff., 260, 267, 400 ; oneness, 240 ; personal, 239 ; power (physical not moral), 238, 270 ; providence, 261 f. ; spirit of, 240 ff., 264 f. ; transcendent, 266 ; wanting in holiness and love, 261, 429, 433.
philosophical (Greek), 464.
'Golden Rule,' the, Confucian, 70.

Hardy, Thomas, and pantheism, 23, 50.
Heiler, F., on Nirvana, 127.
Hindu concepts—
advaita, 24, 41 ff., 50, 165 ; *ahimsa*, 9, 12 ; *bhakti*, 39 f., 41 f., 43 f., 429 ; *Brahman*, 31 ff., 37, 432 ; *dharma*, 34, 382 ; *jñana*, 44 ; *karma*, 24 f., 37, 49 f., 162, 382, 432 ; *moksha*, 30, 33, 50, 131, 385 ; *maya*, 24 f., 49 f., 432 ; *samsara*, 29 ; *sangathan*, 6 ; *sannyasis*, 35, 37 ; *shuddhi*, 7 ; *yoga*, 37, 132–5.
Hinduism—
as a whole, 3–52, 360–3, 381–6 *passim*.
aim of, 18 f. ; animism, 3 f. ; caste, 7, 20 f. ; and Christianity, 8, 45–52, 360 f. ; changes in, 3 ff. ; divine immanence, 22, 31 f. ; educated classes, 5, 48 ; home-life, 49 ; Maha Sabha, 6 ff. ; and Moslems, 7 ; mysticism, 28, 38 ff. ; nationalism, 7 ; peasants, 47 f. ; pantheism, 21–4 ; quietism, 29, 32, 34 f., 37, 51 ; ritual, 20 ; task of, 46 f., 151 ; values, 18, 361, 382 f. ; Vedanta doctrine, 26 ff., 38, 42 ; virtues of, 25, 27, 37 f., 40 ; lack of energy, 9, 25, 34, 50, 361 ; womanhood, 49 f.
Hodous, L. (*quoted*), 145 ff.
Holy Spirit—
Buddhist parallel, 175 ; *filioque* in East and West, 268 ; fruits of, 279, 332 ; God's self-donation, 470 ; in Islam, 239 ff., 264 f. ; quickening power, 82, 280 f., 386, 397, 458, 489 f. ; as transcendental immanence, 27 f., 78.
Hughes, E. R. (*quoted*), 75 f.
Humanism and Christianity, 289.

Immortality—
Buddhism, 134, 141, 149, 177, 194, 432 ; Islam, 262 ff., 365 ; secularism, 321 f.
India, nationalism, 7 ff., 384 ; obstacles to Christianity, 362 f., 383 ; present unrest, 7 f. ; reform movements, 6 ; secularism, 363.
See also Gandhi, Hinduism, Radhakrishnan.
Indian Social Reformer (*quoted*), 5, 10, 13.
Inge, Dean—
Asia's need, 16, 18 ; Fourth Gospel, 161, 303 ; mysticism, 127.
International Fellowship, 15.
Irenæus (*quoted*), 41 f.
Ishizuka San's beliefs (Buddhist), 169–77.
Islam—
as a whole, 236–83, 365–8.
Azhar and liberal ideas, 255 f. ; agnosticism, 254 ff. ; atheism, 346, 402 ; atonement lacking, 238, 433 ; and the Bible, 465 ; brotherhood, 250 ff., 275 ; Caliphate problem, 258, 410 : in Egypt, 254 ff., India, 7, 257, Persia, 257, Turkey, 257, 410 ; fatalism, 260 f. ;

family life, 277 f.; Holy Spirit, 239 ff., 264; intercession, 265 f.; Jesus, 243 ff., 367, 399; Logos doctrine, 241 f.; missionary zeal, 252, 275; Mohammed's place, 248 ff., 256, 266; mysticism, 240 f., 274; paradise, 263 f., 366; prayer, 245 ff., 273; Quran, criticism of, 255 ff., reading of, 246, 264 f., 273; reforms advocated, 256 f.; resurrection, 366 ff.; secularism, 402; social virtues, 259 f.; Trinity, 266–9; varieties of, 237, 254; views of God, *see* God (Moslem); womanhood, 277 f.; *zikhr*, 246 f., 273. *See also* Mohammed.
Islamic sects—
Ahmadiyya, 255, 257; *Shia*, 257; *Sufi*, 247; *Sunni*, 237.

James, William (*quoted*), 36, 51, 435.
Japan—
atheism, 151, 229 f.; Buddhism, 146, 150–7, 160 f., 166–9, 187, 215 *et seq.*; educational system, effects on, 225; Far Eastern Buddhist Convention, 148; love of life, 220, 230; materialism and militarism, 13, 152; patriotism, a religion, 221 f., 233; Nietzscheanism, 152; philosophical trends, 146, 151, 153 f.; obstacles to Christianity, 227 f., 232 ff.; science, 305; secularism, 147; social service, 228 f.; syncretism of Buddhism and Christianity, 151–7, peril of, 157; womanhood, 371; youth and religious experience, 150 *et seq.* *See also* Buddhism.
Japanese delegates' findings on comparison of religions, 422 ff.
Jesus Christ—
adequacy for all life, 400 f.; Bible's interpreter, the, 466 f.; compared with Buddha, 157 ff., 162–6, 175, 196, 202 ff., 395; Chinese Christians' views of, 74, 80 f., 112 ff., 118; climax of religion, 438, 469; Cross, 16, 25, 27, 29 f., 157, 163, 359; dynamic of ethical personality, 446 ff.; and Hindu character, 13; Ideal Man, 334 f., 358, 360, 397, 445 ff., 481; inexhaustibility, 335; in Islam, 242–5, 258 f., 271; Eternal Word: 451, 466, and Buddhism, 119, 160, 202, 432, and Hindu *Jñana*, 44, and Islam, 241 f., and Vedas, 28; *logos spermatikos* to other religions, 354; compared with Mohammed, 256, 258, 467 f.; and mysticism, 40 f., 44, 135 f., 158, 359; resurrection, 348 f., 367 f.; revealer of God, 312, 333, 359, 397, 450 ff., 481; unique value, 343, 356, 418, 428, 445, 449, 463; universality of His appeal, 309, 441–5; His way of victory, 30 *et seq.*, 310, 330; and womanhood, 370–3. *See also* Christianity, Logos.
Jews and Judaism, 433, 436 f., 491.

Kagawa, Toyohiko, on Buddhism, 140, 151–7.
Kaneko, H., on Buddhism, 166 ff.
Keith, A. B. (*quoted*), 129.
Keng, L. B. (*quoted*), 77 f.
Kingdom of God, 27, 336 f., 385, 397.
Korea, 215, 219 f., 372, 387, 410.

Labour and secularism, 287.
Lake, Kirsopp, on Logos Christology, 161.
Latin America, and Christ, 376, 411, 444 f., 455 ff.
Logos, 28, 119, 160, 451; *logos spermatikos*, 354.

Mackintosh, H. R. (*quoted*), 451.
MacTaggart, J. M. E. (*quoted*), 33.
Materialism—
and Christianity, 474; Confucianism, 77; German reaction against, 408 f., 415 f. *See also* Secularism.
Mencius—
ancestor worship, 71 f.; cosmic harmony, 389; democracy, 67; man's moral nature, 90 f.; spirits, 71.
Missionary—
method, 16 f.; need for scientific equipment, 305; personal religion, 399 f., 489; task in Asia, 166.
Missions—
basis of, 280 f., 434, 470 f.; Buddhist, 148, 396; Moslem, 252 ff., 258, 282; motive of, Christian, 483–6 *et passim.*
Mohammed—
devotion to, 248 ff.; moral character, 256; compared with Jesus Christ, 258 f., 467 f. *See also* Islam.
Monism, 28, 39, 43.
See also Hindu concepts, *advaita.*
Moonje, Dr, on modern Hindu aims, 6, 9.
Morgan, William, on comparison of religions, 432 ff.
Motzu (Mo Ti) on divine personality, 69, 105.
Mysticism—
Buddhist, 124–8, 130 f., 132 ff., 152, 188 ff.; Hindu, 28, 38 ff., symbols of, 39; Johannine, 127, 160 f., 165, 438 f.; Moslem, 240 f., 274; an obstacle in China, 73 f.; Pauline, ethical, 202.

Nationalism—
Indian, 6–11; Japanese, 221 f., 233; Turkish, 257.
Naturalism and Christianity, 369, 460. *See also* Secularism.
Nietzsche (*quoted*), 207.
Nietzscheanism, in Japan, 152.
Nirvana, see Buddhism *passim.*

Obstacles to spread of Christianity—
China, 73 f., 112 ff., 390; Europe, 404 f.; India, 362 f., 383; Japan, 227 f., 232; the Orient, 204.
Otto, Rudolf—
on mysticism and *nirvana*, 125; 'numinous,' 449; relation of Christianity to Hinduism, 382 f.

Pantheism—
Buddhist, 151 f., 154; Confucian, 358; Hindu, 21–4; monistic, and Christian, 28.
Paul, St, 202, 435 ff., 472.
Personality—
and democracy, 475; divine, in Buddhism, 202 f., 214, in Christianity, 202 f., 214 f., in Confucianism, 69, 86 f., 102–9; ethical, 201–7, 397, 446 ff., vagueness of, in Buddhism, 213 f.; human, 171, in Hinduism, 41 ff., 371; and mysticism, 190; respect for, 15 ff., by Governments, 397, 484; and science, 311 f.
Platonism and Christianity, 303 f., 357, 433, 464.
Plotinus, 38.
Pringle-Pattison, A. S. (*quoted*), 32, 162.

Quran. *See* Islam.

Racial pride and Christ, 436 ff., 466.
Radhakrishnan, Prof. (*quoted*), 18 f., 20, 24, 28, 34 f., 37 f.
Ranade, M. G. (*quoted*), 6, 12, 50.
Rationalism and miracle, 292 ff. *See* Secularism.
Reality and ethical personality, 202 f.
Reformation, the, and secularism, 290 f.

Reichelt, A. K., on Buddhism, 148 ff., 163 ff.
Religion—
Chinese view of, 68; definition of, 33, 85, 307; and devotion, 38–41; essentials of, 424 f., 460, 462.
Resurrection, 273, 348, 366.
Rhys Davids, Mrs (*quoted*), 129, 140.
Rojas, Don Ricardo (*quoted*), 444 f.
Russell, Hon. B.—
on American missionaries, 13; China, 11–13; western education in India, 14.

Sakyamuni—
and Christianity, 160, 162–6; divinity, 130, 137, 143, 209, 432; as example, 173; greatness, 134 f., 158; historic figure, 128 ff., 350, 354; influence, 204–7; missionary, 198 f.; mystic, 130 f., 134 f., 158, 201; philosopher, 131 f., 187; religion of, 186–207; as *yogi*, 159.
Salvation, Christian—
compared with Buddhist views, 123, 131, 142, 165, 176, 197, 199 *et seq.*; with Hindu views, 33 f., 36, 385.
See also Sin.
Science—
method of, 232, 299 ff.; oriental students and, 305; Chinese, 106 ff., 147, 266 f., 296, 344 ff., 403; religion of, 301 f., 314, 412.
Scientists and Christianity, 291 f., 308, 314, 492 f.
Secularism—
as a whole, 284–338, 373 ff., 402–14.
Biblical criticism and, 294–7; challenge of, 412 f.; defined, 284; æsthetics and, 299 f.; ethical force, 379; economic influences upon, 289 f., 316 f., 326 f.; extent, 284–7; history of growth, 288–97; historical methods and, 294 ff.; humanism and, 289; and immortality, 321 f.; inadequacy, 318–21, 332, 411; and industrialism, 408, 413; machine age and, 315 f.; and patriotism, 289, in Japan, 221 f., 230; rationalism and, 292 f.; science and, 291–7, *see* Science; spread of: England, 406, China, 346, 358, 403, India, 363, Korea, 372, 410, Mexico, 407, 411 f., Philippines, 405, Scotland, 407 f., South America, 376, 406, 411, Sweden, 408, Turkey, 346, 402, 410; perils of, 320, undermining religions, 471; values of, 297–303, 414; and youth, 303 ff.
Sin—
Buddhist view, 176; Christian, 27, 32, 36 f., 348, 447, 481; Confucian, 73, 394; Semitic, 26 f. *See also* Salvation.
Singh, Sadhu Sundar (*quoted*), 441 f.
Stockholm Conference, 409, 488.
Streeter, B. H. (*quoted*), 36 f., 38.
Syncretism—
in Buddhism, 153 f., 155 f., 216, 229; and Christianity, 355, 368 ff., 420; early Christian, 438 f.
Synthesis between Christianity and other religions, perils of, 350 ff., 355, 369 f.

Tagore, R. (*quoted*), 34, 43.
T'ai Hsü and western secularism, 147, 149.
Terence (*quoted*), 465.
Theism—
Christian, 109; Hindu, 22. *See* Personality, divine.
Trinity, the Holy—
and Buddhism, 175; Islam, 266–9; Christian, 270. *See* also Christianity, God, Holy Spirit.
Tukaram, 12, 29, 44.

'Untouchables,' Maha Sabha and, 7, 10.

Vachakar, Manikkar (*quoted*), 163.
Values—
absolute, 356; Buddhism, 350, 394–8; Confucianism, 83 *et seq.*; Hinduism, 361; defined, 236, in spiritual religion, 417 *et seq.*; problem of, 233 f., 353; secularism, 297–303.
Vedanta. *See* Hinduism.
Victory over evil and the world, Christian and Hindu, 30, 33–8, 482. *See also* Christianity, God.
von Hügel, Baron F. (*quoted*), 32, 43.

Whitehead, A. N. (*quoted*), 307.
Womanhood—
changed status of, 344, 373, 488; China, 65, 370 ff., 391 f.; Confucius on, 370 f., 372, 391 f.; Hinduism, 49, 381; Islam, 277 f.; Japan, 371; Korea, 372; Christianity, 493.
World brotherhood—
Buddhism, 147; Christian, 275 ff., 282; Confucianism, 70 f., 100 ff., 360; Islam, 252, 276.
'World,' the—
Christian and Hindu views, 29 ff.; ethically viewed, 287; scientifically, 293 f.
World Conference on Faith and Order (Lausanne); statement of the Christian Message, 481ff.

Youth—
and Christianity, 375; and secularism, 303 ff.

Zoroastrianism, 433, 465.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LTD., LONDON AND EDINBURGH

DATE DUE

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000022862